

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 261

JC 850 025

AUTHOR Winter, Gene M.; Fadale, LaVerna M.
TITLE A Profile of Instructional Personnel in New York State Postsecondary Occupational Education.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Two Year Coll. Development Center.
SPONS AGENCY New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Grants Administration.
PUB DATE Sep 83
NOTE 101p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrators; *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Questionnaires; State Surveys; *Teacher Characteristics; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education Teachers

IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to develop a demographic and inservice education needs profile of faculty and administrators in New York State two-year college occupational education programs. Surveys were administered to all full-time occupational faculty at 55 two-year colleges, soliciting demographic information, educational history, experiential background, inservice needs, and career plans. In addition, questionnaires were administered to occupational education chairpersons and administrators at these institutions, seeking information on faculty recruitment needs and practices, in addition to demographic characteristics and inservice education needs. Study findings, based on responses from 1,922 faculty members, 274 chairpersons, and 64 central administrators, included the following: (1) 61% of the faculty and over 70% of the administrators and chairpersons were male; (2) 67% of the faculty held a masters degree; (3) over 40% of the chairpersons, but only 14% of the administrators indicated that there was no shortage of candidates for faculty positions; (4) recently employed faculty were perceived to be well prepared in subject area knowledge, and acceptably prepared in knowledge of teaching and of the two-year college student; (5) at least 80% of the faculty had participated in some type of professional development activity during the past 3 years; (6) local or regional workshops were preferred by over half of the faculty; and (7) over half of the faculty preferred a subject matter or field content focus, as compared to nearly 25% who preferred a teaching-oriented focus. The study report includes a comparison of findings with a 1975 research study and the survey instruments. (LAL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED252261

A PROFILE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL in New York State Postsecondary Occupational Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. M. Winter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

September 1983

Two Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

A PROFILE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL
IN NEW YORK STATE
POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
(VEA 53-83-0348)

Project Staff

Gene M. Winter, Project Director
LaVerna M. Fadale, Research Associate

Support Staff

Norah Davis
Peggy Normandin

Two-Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

In cooperation with

Bureau of Grants Administration
State Education Department

September 1983

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project could not have been carried out without the 40 Chief Academic Officers that agreed to participate in this study and coordinated the distribution and return of the questionnaires at their colleges. The effort extended by them on behalf of the project is sincerely appreciated.

We also wish to extend gratitude to the more than 2,200 faculty, department chairpersons and administrators who took the time to complete yet one more questionnaire!

Funding for this project was provided under PL-94-482
Title II, Vocational Education, Subpart 3
Education Amendments of 1976
Administered by the New York State Education Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background and Procedures.	1
Population, Sample and Response Rate	2
Organization of Report	6
Section A: Academic Identification Variables.	8
Summary Profile.	8
Faculty Respondents: Academic Identification Variables.	9
Chairperson and Administrator Respondents: Academic Identification Variables	13
Section B: Selected Demographic Characteristics	16
Summary Profile.	16
Selected Demographic Characteristics of Faculty.	17
Selected Demographic Characteristics of Chairpersons and Administrators	24
Section C: Selected Experience Variables.	27
Summary Profile.	27
Description by Selected Experience Variables: Highest Earned Degree.	28
Section D: Faculty Recruitment Needs and Procedures	46
Summary Profile.	46
Faculty Recruitment Needs and Procedures: Roles in Recruitment Process	47
Section E: Actual and Preferred Qualifications of Recently Employed Faculty.	55
Summary Profile.	55
Actual and Preferred Qualifications of Recently Employed Faculty	56
Section F: Inservice Education Participation, Preferences and Priorities	60
Summary Profile.	60
Inservice Education Participation and Preferences: Non-Credit Activities.	61
Inservice Education Priorities Perceived by Chairpersons and Administrators.	67

	Page
Section G: Future Career Plans.	73
Summary Profile.	73
Future Career Plans of Faculty	74
Future Plans of Administrators and Chairpersons.	78
Summary Observations	80
Appendix A	83
Appendix B	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Population Estimate and Responses by Region.	3
2	Population Estimate and Responses by College Type. . .	6
3	Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Academic Rank and Region.	9
4	Distribution of Faculty Respondents by Rank and College Type	10
5	Faculty Respondents by Region and Principal Teaching Cluster	11
6	Faculty Respondents by Type of College and Principal Teaching Cluster	12
7	Regional Distribution of Administrators and Department Chairpersons.	13
8	Program Responsibilities of Chairpersons and Administrators	14
9	Department Chairpersons Effort to Teaching	15
10	Gender of Respondents by Type of College	17
11	Gender of Respondents by Principal Teaching Cluster.	18
12	Gender Distribution of Respondents by Planning Region	18
13	Frequency of Respondents by Age Group.	19
14	Respondents Age by Principal Teaching Cluster.	20
15	Respondents by Age and Gender.	21
16	Faculty by Gender and Ethnic Status.	22
17	Ethnic Diversity of Principal Teaching Clusters.	23
18	Respondent Ethnic Diversity by Planning Region	23
19	Gender Distribution of Chairpersons and Administrators	24
20	Age Distribution of Chairpersons and Administrators	26

Table		Page
21	Highest Earned Degree by Region.	28
22	Highest Earned Degree by College Type.	29
23	Frequencies by Region and Year in Which Highest Degree Was Conferred	30
24	Relationship of Degree Field to Teaching Field . . .	31
25	Frequency of Credit Course Enrollment by Region. . .	32
26	Frequency and Field of Credit Hours.	34
27	Years at Current Institution by Region	35
28	Years at Other Colleges by Teaching Cluster.	36
29	Years in Other Educational Institutions.	37
30	Years in Current Position.	38
31	Change Residence	39
32	Change Residence to Accept Current Position.	40
33	Type of Previous Position.	41
34	Number of Years of Related Business Experience . . .	43
35	Chairpersons and Administrators Years in Current Position	44
36	Previous Position of Chairpersons and Administrators	45
37	Summary of Current Shortage of Faculty Candidates	48
38	Summary of Reasons for Anticipated Shortages	49
39	Average Faculty Turnover	50
40	Frequency of Applicant to Vacancy Ratio.	51
41	Typical Degree Status of Recently Employed Faculty.	56
42	Experience of Recently Employed Faculty.	57
43	Attributes of Recently Employed Faculty.	59
44	Participation in Professional Development Activities by Type of Activity and Teaching Cluster	61

Table

Page

45	Percentage Frequencies of Interest in Types of Professional Development Activities in Planning Region.	64
46	Inservice Education Priorities	67
47	Faculty Development Program Topics	69
48	Near Future Career Plans	74
49	Future Plans by Type of College.	75
50	Future Plans by Planning Region.	76
51	Future Plans by Principal Teaching Cluster	77
52	Near Future Plans of Administrators and Chairpersons	78

A PROFILE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL
IN NEW YORK STATE POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

Background and Procedures

This project was carried out under a contract with the New York State Education Department, Bureau of Grants Administration. The purpose of the project was to develop a demographic and inservice education needs profile of faculty and administrators in New York State two-year college occupational education programs. The methodology was originally planned as survey research involving a random stratified sample of 20 colleges. During early planning discussions with staff of the Bureau of Grants Administration, the decision was made to expand the sample and seek cooperation of all two-year colleges in the State having occupational programs with the exception of specialized, single-purpose institutions.

Project staff developed three instruments: one for faculty, one for department chairpersons and one for academic administrators. The faculty instrument sought demographic information, educational history, experiential background, inservice needs and career plans. The chairperson and administrator instruments sought information on faculty recruitment needs and practices in addition to demographic characteristics and inservice education needs. The three instruments were finalized in consultation with staff of the Bureau of Grants Administration, Offices of Institutional Research of State University of New York and City University of New York, and the Information Center on Education, New York State Education Department (Appendix A).

A letter outlining the purpose of the project and asking cooperation in carrying it out was sent to the Chief Academic Officer, with a copy to the President, of each two-year college. The request also included sample questionnaires for information purposes. Since the designation of faculty

as occupational is a local determination, the cooperation of local administrators was required to distribute survey instrument to appropriate staff members. The request letter also included a brief response form that could be used to indicate the college's willingness to participate and to designate a contact person or list other requests relative to the data collection process.

Once project staff received notice of willingness to participate the appropriate numbers of each of the three instruments were mailed to the college. College administrators then distributed the instruments and returned completed forms to project staff. Initial requests for participation were sent in the last quarter of the fall 1982 semester. Follow-up requests, instrument distribution and data collection were completed during the spring 1983 semester; coding, processing and analysis during the summer months. Data were analyzed using the descriptive statistics included in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The chi-square statistic was utilized for tests of significance.

Population, Sample and Response Rate

The research population was all full-time occupational education faculty, department chairpersons and academic administrators at 55 two-year colleges in New York State. Forty-one or 75% of the colleges cooperated in distributing and returning the survey instruments. The returns from one institution, Culinary Institute of America, were tabulated and subsequently excluded from the report because of the unique differences in faculty experiences, training and subject matter specialities. This resulted in a data pool of 40 colleges or a 74% response rate.

The source for determining the number of occupational education faculty at each college was the 1981-82 State records, Form OEDS #6. This form asks each college to report the number of full-time occupational education faculty.

The number reported by each college provided an estimate for the number of instruments to send to the participating colleges as well as setting the parameters of the population. The total number of full-time occupational faculty for the population of 55 colleges reported on OEDS #6 for 1981-82 was 3,338. Excluding Culinary Institute, the total population became 3,254 full-time occupational faculty. The total usable faculty questionnaires returned were 1,922 or 59% of the total population. The total number of faculty at the 40 participating colleges was 2,724. The response rate from the participating colleges was 71%. Details of number of faculty reported, number of usable returns and response rates are presented in Table 1 and categorized by occupational planning region. Non-participating colleges are also identified.

Table 1

Population Estimate and Responses by Region

	Faculty Reported OEDS #6	Usable Returns	Returns as a Percent of Population	Response Rate from Participating Colleges
Region 1	<u>376</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>67%</u>	<u>67%</u>
Region 2 (non-response: Kingsborough, Medgar Evers, Hostos, LaGuardia, Fashion Insti- tute of Tech- nology)	<u>774</u>	<u>348</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>72%</u>
Region 3 (non-response: Rockland C.C.)	<u>308*</u>	<u>197*</u>	<u>64%</u>	<u>69%</u>

(Table 1 continued...)

Table 1 (continued)

	Faculty Reported OEDS #6	Usable Returns	Percent of Population	Response Rate from Participating Colleges
Region 4 (non-response: Junior College of Albany, Fulton-Mont- gomery C.C.)	<u>458</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>42%</u>	<u>46%</u>
Region 5 (non-response: Paul Smiths)	<u>71</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>80%</u>
Region 6	<u>99</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78%</u>	<u>78%</u>
Region 7 (non-response: Cazenovia College)	<u>112</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>126%</u>	<u>134%</u>
Region 8	<u>174</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>78%</u>	<u>78%</u>
Region 9 (non-response: Maria Regina, Cayuga C.C.)	<u>159</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>63%</u>
Region 10	<u>187</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>48%</u>
Region 11	<u>26</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>104%</u>	<u>104%</u>
Region 12 (non-response: Villa Maria, Niagara County C.C.)	<u>345</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>59%</u>	<u>76%</u>
Region 13	<u>165</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>104%</u>	<u>104%</u>

Totals All Regions (N=54)	3254	1922	59%	-
Total Population at Responding Colleges (N=40)	2724	1922	-	71%
Non-responding Colleges (N=14)	530	-	-	-

A word about the designation of occupational education faculty is warranted. Faculty who teach in A.A. or A.S. degree programs are not defined as occupational education faculty. A professor of Business Administration or Biological Science in an A.A.S. or A.O.S. degree program is considered occupational but would not be if he or she taught in an A.S. degree program. Change of faculty assignments can cause a change in the number of occupational education faculty each semester. Since the designation must be made by local administrators each year, the population numbers used in Tables 1 and 2 should be viewed as a best estimate made at the time of the OEDS report. Administrators at colleges cooperating with this study had to make the estimate a second time and attach names to the number in order to send the survey instruments to the appropriate faculty members. Errors of estimation by the best intentioned administrator could have occurred at either point in time, but since it is rare that a faculty member is employed to teach only A.S. degree courses or only A.A.S. degree courses at colleges where both degree programs exist, any errors in estimation probably cancel each other or have no effect in terms of individual faculty characteristics. It is also understandable that this survey could receive responses from more than 100% of the estimated population, as was the case in a few regions.

The response rate of 71% from the participating colleges is sufficient to grant generalizability of the findings. The lowest response rate among regions was slightly less than half and occurred in only two regions. The fact that the sample accounts for 59% of the estimated population also strengthens generalizability particularly when many non-respondents were not given the choice as individuals and thus cannot be suspected to possess a non-respondent bias or other differences sometimes attached to non-respondents.

Table 2 recasts the responses by type of college.

Table 2
Population Estimate and Responses by College Type

		Faculty Reported OEDS #6	Usable Returns	Percent of Population	Population; Participating Colleges	Response Rate from Partici- pating Colleges
Ag & Tech Colleges	(6)	601	(6) 484	81%	601	81%
CUNY Comm. Colleges	(8)	626	(4) 348	56%	487	72%
SUNY Comm. Colleges	(30)	1847	(25) 1028	56%	1555	66%
Independent Colleges	(10)	180	(5) 62	34%	81	77%

These data show that the Independent sector may be underrepresented in terms of the total population (34%) but the response rate from the colleges that agreed to participate is a very respectable 77%. The Agricultural and Technical Colleges are best represented with an 81% return and all six colleges included in the sample. Slightly more than half of the total population of Both CUNY and SUNY are included in the returns. The lowest response rate from participating colleges occurred with SUNY Community Colleges but that rate includes two-thirds of the reported population at those colleges.

Organization of Report

The data is presented and discussed in the following sections Academic Identification Variables, Selected Demographic Characteristics, Selected Experience Variables, Faculty Recruitment Needs and Procedures, Actual and Preferred Qualifications of Recently Employed Faculty, Inservice Education Participation, Preferences and Priorities, and Future Career Plans. For easier access to the general findings, each section begins with a Summary Profile that highlights information on each topic. Most data sets were analyzed by several arrays including planning region, principal

teaching program and type of college. This detail is provided within each section. The final section reviews the findings from the point of view of an imaginary President of a college system made up of the 40 colleges that cooperated in this study.

SECTION A: ACADEMIC IDENTIFICATION VARIABLES

Summary Profile

Faculty

- The 1,922 faculty respondents represent 64 principal teaching programs across the Hegis technology areas
- Faculty distribution by rank is approximately
 - 21% Instructor/Lecturer/Technical Specialist
 - 32% Assistant Professor
 - 25% Associate Professor
 - 22% Professor
- Approximately 75% of the respondents are from the fields of Business, Health and Engineering Technologies

Department Chairpersons and Administrators

- The 274 chairpersons represent all major technologies but 74% are from Health, Business and Engineering Technologies
- The 64 central administrators include persons with multi-departmental administrative duties; Associate Deans, Deans, Vice Presidents are the more common titles of respondents
- 45% of the administrators have college-wide responsibilities
- Approximately 75% of the chairpersons devote 50% or less of their time to teaching

Faculty Respondents: Academic Identification Variables

In addition to identifying their college, respondents were asked to indicate their faculty rank, principal teaching cluster and principal teaching program area. The Hegis classification system of six technology areas was used for the cluster identification. Certificate programs were also offered as a cluster option. The teaching program item was open-ended, allowing each person to respond specifically. A frequency list of the 64 teaching programs is attached as Appendix B.

Table 3 presents the sample of 1922 faculty by academic rank organized by occupational planning region.*

Table 3

Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Academic Rank and Region

Region	N	Instructor	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Professor	Tech. Spec.	Lecturer
1-Long Island	249	12.4%	38.2%	22.5%	24.5%	2.4%	-
2-New York City	345	9.3%	30.1%	27.8%	22.9%	.3%	9.6%
3-Lower Hudson	196	22.4%	26.5%	32.1%	18.4%	.5%	-
4-Capital District	190	21.1%	28.9%	22.6%	25.3%	1.6%	.5%
5-Northeast	28	21.4%	46.4%	25.0%	7.1%	-	-
6-St. Lawrence	77	19.4%	29.9%	28.6%	19.5%	-	2.6%
7-Mohawk Valley	139	21.6%	33.8%	20.9%	22.3%	-	1.4%
8-Western Catskill	133	14.3%	34.6%	27.8%	21.8%	1.5%	-
9-Central New York	64	18.8%	51.6%	23.4%	4.7%	-	1.6%
10-Central-West	90	10.0%	37.8%	34.4%	17.8%	-	-
11-Central-South	26	-	19.2%	30.8%	50.0%	-	-
12-Niagara Frontier	202	40.1%	24.8%	11.9%	23.3%	-	-
13-Southwest	169	21.3%	24.9%	27.8%	20.1%	4.1%	1.8%
TOTALS	1908	18.6%	31.4%	25.1%	21.7%	1.0%	2.2%

(Missing observations = 14)

*Percentages are reported throughout the report as adjusted frequency percentages of those who actually responded to the item.

As shown by Table 3 totals, 50% of the respondents are at Instructor and Assistant Professor levels and 46.8% at Associate and full Professor levels; roughly a 50/50 ratio. A number of exceptions to this ratio can be found on a region-by-region basis; the ratio in Region 9 is 72/28.

Region 2 makes much more use of the Lecturer rank than other regions. When Lecturer and Instructor are combined with Instructor and Assistant Professor, the distribution in Region 2 closely resembles that of the total sample.

Regions 5 and 9 have close to half of their faculty at the Assistant level. The two higher ranks, Associate and Professor, account for less than one-third of the respondents in both regions. Instructors account for 40% of the sample in Region 12 in contrast to the sample from Region 11 which has no Instructors and 50% at the Professor rank.

Table 4

Distribution of Faculty Respondents
by Rank and College Type

Rank	SUNY CC's		ATC's		CUNY CC's		Independent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Instructor	225	22%	71	15%	32	9%	27	44%
Assistant Professor	313	30%	160	33%	104	30%	22	35%
Associate Professor	258	25%	116	24%	96	28%	9	13%
Professor	209	21%	122	25%	79	23%	4	6%
Technical Specialist	9	1%	9	2%	1	-	1	2%
Lecturer	5	.5%	4	1%	33	10%	0	-
TOTAL	1019		484		345		62	

Missing Cases = 9

Recasting these data by type of college displays some differences that were not apparent in the table by region. Respondents from Independent colleges were predominately from the lower two faculty ranks (79%) while the

other groupings of colleges display 76% to 82% of the respondents encompassed by Assistant, Associate and Professor ranks. Only in the Independent sector did any one rank account for more than one-third of the total respondents from that type of college.

The survey instrument asked faculty to identify their principal teaching program cluster. Certificate programs was offered as an option in addition to the six Hegis technology areas. Table 5 presents the detail of respondents by principal teaching cluster and planning region.

Table 5
Faculty Respondents by Region and Principal Teaching Cluster

Region	Total N	Data Proc	Health	Mech Eng	Nat Sci	Business	Pub Serv	Certif
1-Long Island	251 13.1%	4.4%	29.1%	13.9%	5.6%	42.6%	4.0%	.4%
2-New York City	348 18.1%	5.5%	37.9%	17.0%	10.1%	29.6%	.0%	.0%
3-Lower Hudson	197 10.3%	7.1%	26.9%	12.7%	8.6%	32.5%	8.1%	4.1%
4-Capital District	190 9.9%	5.3%	22.1%	6.3%	22.6%	30.0%	12.1%	1.6%
5-Northeast	23 1.5%	7.1%	46.4%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	17.9%	.0%
6-St. Lawrence	77 4.0%	3.9%	19.5%	22.1%	9.1%	23.4%	13.0%	9.1%
7-Mohawk Valley	141 7.3%	7.1%	13.5%	26.2%	11.3%	38.3%	2.8%	.7%
8-West Catskill	135 7.0%	3.7%	21.5%	23.7%	11.9%	26.7%	4.4%	8.1%
9-Central New York	64 3.3%	6.3%	29.7%	14.1%	.0%	32.8%	12.5%	4.7%
10-Central West	90 4.7%	4.4%	34.4%	16.7%	5.6%	33.3%	5.6%	.0%
11-Central South	27 1.4%	7.4%	25.9%	22.2%	14.8%	22.2%	7.4%	.0%
12-Niagara	203 10.6%	3.4%	31.5%	24.1%	4.4%	28.6%	7.9%	.0%
13-Southwest	170 8.8%	2.9%	15.3%	33.5%	17.6%	21.8%	2.4%	6.5%
Totals	1921 100.0%	5.0%	27.2%	18.4%	10.2%	31.2%	5.7%	2.3%
Missing Observations = 1								

The highest percentage of respondents represent the Business area (31.2%) followed by Health (27.2%) and Mechanical and Engineering Technologies (18.4%). These three teaching areas account for approximately 75% of the sample in each region except Regions 8, 11 and 13. In two of these regions, the presence of Agricultural and Technical Colleges increase the percentage of Certificate program faculty and Natural Science faculty and thus explain the small differences.

Since Business, Engineering and Health are high enrollment areas, these data support the generalizability of the sample to the larger population.

Examining faculty by college type reveals a predominance of Health Science faculty from Independent Colleges compared to a significantly larger proportion of Natural Science faculty and smaller proportion of Health Science faculty in the Agricultural and Technical Colleges. Occupational education programs are not evenly distributed among all colleges and these data generally reflect these differences.

Table 6
Faculty Respondents by Type of College and
Principal Teaching Cluster

	Upstate Comm. Coll.		ATC's		CUNY		Independents	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Data Processing	59	8%	18	4%	19	6%	-	-
Health	287	28%	70	15%	132	38%	34	55%
Mech Eng	165	16%	129	27%	59	17%	-	-
Nat Science	50	5%	109	23%	35	10%	2	3%
Business	373	36%	110	23%	103	30%	13	21%
Public Service	81	8%	20	4%	-	-	8	13%
Certificate	12	1%	28	6%	-	-	5	8%
Totals	1027	100%	484	100%	348	100%	62	100%

(Missing cases = 1)

Chairperson and Administrator Respondents: Academic Identification Variables

In addition to occupational faculty, 273 department chairpersons and 64 academic administrators completed survey instruments. Table 7 presents the frequency of these two respondent groups by planning region.

Table 7

Regional Distribution of Administrators and Department Chairpersons

Region	Department Chairs		Academic Administrators	
	N	%	N	%
1-Long Island	23	8.4	4	6.3
2-New York City	35	12.8	7	10.9
3-Lower Hudson	48	17.6	15	23.4
4-Capital District	40	14.7	8	12.5
5-Northeast	6	2.2	3	4.7
6-St. Lawrence	17	6.2	5	7.8
7-Mohawk Valley	18	6.6	2	3.1
8-West Catskill	20	7.3	-	-
9-Central New York	10	3.7	1	1.6
10-Central West	14	5.1	7	10.9
11-Central South	4	1.5	1	1.6
12-Niagara	15	5.5	5	7.8
13-Southwest	23	8.4	6	9.4
Total	273	100.0%	64	100.0%

The Academic Administrator group includes several titles such as Associate Deans, Dean of Divisions, Deans of the College, and Academic Vice Presidents, reflecting the range of titles used at different campuses. Region 3 accounts for the highest percentage of total respondents. Region 4 is next in terms of one region's impact on the distribution. In both instances this is a function of a larger number of cooperating colleges in those regions as well as relative size of the colleges.

The distribution of program responsibilities of the chairpersons and administrators is presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Program Responsibilities of
Chairpersons and Administrators

Principal Academic Program Responsibilities	Department Chairs		Academic Administrators	
	N	%	N	%
Data Processing	10	3.7	5	7.8
Health Technologies	76	27.8	8	12.5
Engineering Technology	64	23.4	8	12.5
Natural Science Technology	30	11.0	2	3.1
Business Technology	62	22.7	6	9.4
Public Service Technology	23	8.4	3	4.7
Certificate Programs	4	1.5	3	4.7
Continuing Education	-	-	2	3.1
College-wide	-	-	22	34.4
Two of above	5	1.5	5	7.8
Totals	274	100.0%	64	100.0%

Health, Business and Engineering Technology department chairs are most numerous, reflecting the higher incidence of those programs across the state. Data Processing program responsibilities were sometimes included with those of a Business department chairperson.

Over one-third of the administrators have college-wide responsibilities in comparison to 65.6% who report program area responsibilities.

Department chairpersons were asked to also indicate their effort distribution between teaching and departmental administration. The responses ranged from 1% to 100% of time devoted to administration. These data are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

Department Chairpersons Effort to Teaching

<u>Effort</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
10% or less	37	13.9
11-20%	34	12.7
21-30%	36	13.5
31-40%	36	13.5
41-50%	55	20.6
51-60%	18	6.7
61-70%	18	6.7
71-80%	25	9.4
81-100%	8	3.0
Totals	267	100.0%

Missing cases = 6

The distribution of teaching effort among department chairs is fairly uniform up to 40%. Approximately 20% are half-time teaching faculty and only 3% are essentially extra duty department administrators. Although these data do not show a predominant practice among the colleges, nearly 75% of the chairpersons devote 50% or less of their time to teaching or stated another way, about 25% of the chairpersons teach more than half time.

SECTION B: SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Summary Profile

Faculty

Gender: total sample - Male 61% Female 39%

- SUNY & CUNY Community Colleges - male 57% female 43%
- Agricultural & Technical Colleges - male 76% female 24%
- Independent Colleges - male 48% female 52%
- The gender distribution varies widely among principal teaching cluster. Females comprise 3% of Engineering Technology faculty and 79% of Health Technology faculty.

Age: average age, 44.5 years

- rather even distribution across age groups from 35 or less (20%), to 56 and greater (17%)
- Region 2 has a somewhat older faculty and Region 9 a younger faculty
- Females comprise 46% of the faculty, age 35 or less
- There are only slight differences among program areas; Data Processing and Natural Science faculty tend to be younger as groups and Engineering has over 20% of its faculty in the 56+ group

Ethnic status: 92% are White/Caucasian

- Health Technologies have highest percentage of minority faculty (10%)
- Region 2 has the highest percentage of minority faculty (22%)

Chairpersons and Administrators

Gender: Both groups are over 70% male

- 50% or greater of the chairpersons from Regions 9 and 10 are female
- 50% of the administrators from Region 7 are female
- 60% of the chairpersons from Health Technologies are female but only 5% of Engineering Technology chairpersons are female

Age: average age of chairpersons is 48.5 years

- average age of administrators is 50.4 years
- over 50% of both groups are between 41 and 55 years of age
- Public Service Technology chairpersons tend to be younger than other program area chairpersons

Ethnic status: Ethnic minorities were not represented in administrator respondents but did comprise 8% of the chairperson group

- all minority chairpersons, except two persons, are from Regions 2 and 3

Selected Demographic Characteristics of Faculty

Respondents were asked to answer optional items on age, sex and ethnic status. Overall, 1,867 persons chose to respond to the gender item: male, 61.2%; female, 38.8%. One hundred nineteen (119) persons chose not to answer. The responses by college type are displayed below.

Table 10

Gender of Respondents by Type of College

	<u>N</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
SUNY Community Colleges	973	57.6%	42.4%
CUNY Community Colleges	315	56.2%	43.8%
Agricultural/Technical Colleges	458	75.8%	24.2%
Independent Colleges	121	47.9%	52.1%
Respondent Totals	1867	61.2%	38.8%

These data detail male-female ratios among types of colleges. The ratios are particularly marked between Agricultural and Technical College and Independent College respondents. However, these distributions generally reflect statewide data on total full-time instructional faculty.¹

¹College and University Employees, New York State 1981-82, State Education Department, Information Center on Education, Albany, NY.

Table 11

Gender of Respondents by Principal Teaching Cluster

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Male %</u>	<u>Female %</u>
Data Processing Technologies	92	79.3	20.7
Health Technology	505	21.4	78.6
Engineering Technology	329	97.3	2.7
Natural Science Technology	179	82.1	17.9
Business & Commerce Technology	555	62.5	37.5
Public Service Technology	105	57.1	42.9
Certificate Programs	40	80.0	20.0

Table 11 details faculty gender differences by principal teaching cluster. The distributions generally follow gender-traditional occupations; predominately females in Health fields and predominately males in Engineering, Natural Science and Data Processing faculty positions. Public Service shows the most even ratio.

Table 12 recasts the gender distribution of respondents by region.

Table 12

Gender Distribution of Respondents by Planning Region

<u>Region</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Male %</u>	<u>Female %</u>
1-Long Island	238	52.9	47.1
2-New York City	315	56.2	43.8
3-Lower Hudson	182	60.4	39.6
4-Capital District	178	59.0	41.0
5-Northeast	27	40.7	59.3
6-St. Lawrence	75	70.7	29.3
7-Mohawk Valley	136	69.1	30.9
8-West Catskill	127	74.8	25.2
9-Central New York	62	46.8	53.2
10-CentWest	37	44.8	55.2
11-CentSouth	25	72.0	28.0
12-Niagara	195	55.4	44.6
13-SouthWest	158	77.2	22.8

These data reflect the impact of types of colleges and their program differences. For example, Agricultural and Technical colleges dominate the

sample in Regions 6, 8 and 13 resulting in ratios in those regions that approximate the ATC ratios previously shown in Table 10.

Age of respondents ranged from 25 years or less (1.2%) to over 65 years of age (1.1%). Only 5% of the respondents were included in the 26-30 age category. Because of the small numbers in the extreme categories these data were regrouped as follows:

Table 13

Frequency of Respondents by Age Group

<u>Numbers of Respondents</u>	<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
376	35 or less	20.3
350	36-40	18.9
325	41-45	17.5
275	46-50	14.8
210	51-55	11.3
320	56+	17.2

(Missing cases 130)

These data detail a rather even distribution across age categories. Over one-third of the respondents were under 40 years of age.

The relationship of age to rank was also examined. The results are those that might be expected: Lecturers and Instructors account for 88% of the age group 35 or less, Associate and Professors account for about two-thirds of the age groups 46-50, 51-55 and 56 and older, and about half of the Assistant Professors were 40 years of age or younger. No significant differences were found in two-way analyses of age and rank using the chi-square statistic and a .05 confidence level.

The average age for all respondents was 44.5 years of age. In 1975-76

the average age for faculty statewide was 42.9.²

The analysis distribution of faculty respondents' age by planning region yielded the following results. Nine of the 13 regions generally reflect the overall distribution. Region 2, however, has an older faculty; only 21% are 40 or less years of age while 40% are over 50 years of age. Region 5 displays a bimodal distribution with relatively few faculty in the 41-45 category and none over 56. Region 8 also tends toward a bimodal distribution but less dramatically. Region 9, however, is a younger faculty with 63% 40 years old or less and only 7% over 50 years of age.

Since Region 2 is comprised of CUNY Community Colleges, the distribution of age of respondents by type of college was also reviewed. Although Agricultural and Technical College faculty are slightly older than SUNY Community College and Independent College faculty, the major difference among college types is that CUNY (Region 2) faculty respondents are significantly older than other groups as previously noted.

Age distribution was also examined by principal teaching cluster.

Table 14

Respondents Age by Principal Teaching Cluster

		Age in Percentages of Total					
	N	35 or less	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56+
Data Processing	93	26.9	19.4	17.2	11.8	14.0	10.8
Health	501	17.8	17.2	20.2	17.2	11.2	16.6
Engineering	328	20.7	16.8	16.2	14.0	10.7	21.6
Natural Science	175	14.9	25.7	23.4	13.7	10.9	12.0
Business	551	22.1	18.5	14.7	15.6	10.3	18.7
Public Service	106	24.5	17.9	17.0	9.4	16.0	15.1
Certificate	40	20.0	22.5	20.0	12.5	12.5	12.5
Totals	1794	20.3	18.6	17.7	14.9	11.3	17.2

Missing observations = 128

²Beamish, Eric, et al., An Assessment of Needs for Professional Personnel for Occupational Education in New York State, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1977.

Table 14 details the rather even distributions of ages in each teaching area which resemble the total respondent sample. Data Processing faculty, as a group, are slightly younger and nearly half of the Natural Science faculty are between the ages of 36 and 45. Engineering faculty have the highest percentage in the 56+ column. Over 50% of the faculty in all teaching clusters are accounted for in the 45 years or younger categories.

A relatively even distribution of the sample by age and sex is evident in Table 15 below.

Table 15

Respondents by Age and Gender

Total	N	35 or less %	36-40 %	41-45 %	46-50 %	51-55 %	56+ %
Male	1084	18.0	19.8	18.3	14.9	11.0	18.1
Female	708	23.9	16.8	16.8	15.0	11.7	15.8

(Missing observations = 130)

The higher percentage of female respondents from the 30 or less age group may reflect sex equity efforts in recent years in terms of college efforts to recruit more female faculty members. This trend is noteworthy since it translates to a 54/46 ratio of males to females in this age grouping.

Table 16 summarizes respondents by gender and ethnic status.

Table 16
Faculty by Gender and Ethnic Status

	N	White/ Caucasian	Native American	Spanish Surname	Asian	Black
Male	1046	93.8%	1.5%	.9%	1.6%	2.2%
Female	701	90.2%	1.9%	1.3%	.9%	5.8%
Total	1747	92.3%	1.7%	1.0%	1.3%	3.7%

(Missing observations = 175)

The ethnic status of the statewide sample was 92.3% White/Caucasian. The Beamish study reported 96.2% of the postsecondary occupational faculty as White, excluding CUNY data.³ Recalculating these data using the same exclusion would result in a finding of 95% White/Caucasian.

Minorities comprise about 8% of the sample overall; 10% of the female faculty and 6% of the male faculty. According to State records on ethnic status of faculty this sample may be underrepresented by ethnic minority members. There are also strong feelings among some groups that identification of minority status on surveys such as these produces useless and potentially misleading data. Approximately 8% of the respondents did not answer this questionnaire item.

Reviewing ethnic status by age it was found that approximately 10% were 30 or less years of age while 45% were 41 to 50 years of age.

³Beamish et al, Op. Cit.

Table 17

Ethnic Diversity of Principal Teaching Clusters

	<u>Caucasian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Spanish Surname</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>
Data Processing	93.3%	2.2%	1.1%	2.2%	1.1%
Health	90.1	1.4	.8	1.0	6.7
Engineering	93.3	1.9	1.0	2.9	1.0
Natural Science	94.2	1.7	.6	1.7	1.7
Business	92.5	1.9	1.3	.7	3.6
Public Service	92.3	1.0	1.9	-	4.8

This table details the rather consistent ethnic make-up of the respondents within teaching clusters. Minority groups comprise approximately 10% of Health Technology faculty and less than 8% in all other areas. Another view of the ethnic status of the sample is presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Respondent Ethnic Diversity by Planning Region

	<u>Caucasian</u>	<u>Natural American</u>	<u>Spanish Surname</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>
Region 1	90.6	2.1	2.6	1.7	3.0
2	78.1	1.7	3.1	3.5	13.5
3	91.4	3.4	.6	1.7	2.9
4	97.1	1.7	-	-	1.2
5	100.0	-	-	-	-
6	97.3	2.7	-	-	-
7	97.0	.7	.7	.7	.7
8	97.6	.8	-	-	1.6
9	95.2	-	-	1.6	3.2
10	98.8	-	-	1.2	-
11	92.0	4.0	-	4.0	-
12	95.8	1.0	-	-	3.1
13	96.1	1.9	.6	1.3	-
total (N = 1614)	92.3	1.7	1.0	1.3	3.7

This table graphically shows the impact of Region 2 data on the statewide sample totals as well as the lack of ethnic diversity of the respondents from upstate rural regions.

Several statistically significant relationships were found between minority status and other variables. Since the number of ethnic minorities the relationships may be more numerically than operationally important but a few will be reported as at least potential indications of trends.

Asian ethnic status faculty were more likely to have more years of college teaching experience at other institutions. Faculty of Black ethnic status were more likely to have had hospital teaching experience. More Asian faculty changed residence to accept their current position and more Native Americans list their future plans as open to change.

Selected Demographic Characteristics of Chairpersons and Administrators

Gender. Both groups have a similar gender ratio: administrators are 78% male and chairpersons 71% male. The distribution by region is presented below.

Table 19

Gender Distribution of Chairpersons and Administrators

Region	N	Chairpersons		N	Administrators	
		Male	Female		Male	Female
1-Long Island	23	70%	30%	3	100%	-
2-New York City	32	72%	28%	7	71%	29%
3-Lower Hudson	46	72%	28%	13	69%	31%
4-Capital District	35	69%	31%	8	87%	13%
5-Northeast	5	80%	20%	3	100%	-
6-St. Lawrence	17	88%	12%	5	80%	20%
7-Mohawk Valley	17	76%	24%	8	50%	50%
8-West Catskill	19	63%	37%	-	-	-
9-Central New York	10	50%	50%	1	100%	-
10-Central West	12	42%	58%	6	67%	33%
11-Central South	4	75%	25%	1	100%	-
12-Niagara	15	67%	33%	5	60%	40%
13-Southwest	23	91%	9%	6	100%	-
Totals	258	71%	29%	60	78%	22%
Missing cases	15			4		

The approximate 70-80% male and 30-20% female ratios among chairpersons is fairly representative of all regions except 9 and 10 where women comprise half or more of the respondents, and Regions 6 and 13 where higher male ratios exist in those ATC dominant regions.

For the administrators, the overall percentage of 22% female is matched in only one region while Region 7 displays an even ratio. The smaller numbers in each region tend to make ratio differences appear large, although no less accurate.

The gender distribution by technology area revealed expected differences among department chairpersons. Females comprise 60% of Health program chairpersons and 36% of the Public Service respondents but only 5% of the Engineering program chairpersons. The gender ratio in the other technologies approximates a 72/28 overall ratio.

The administrators group encompassed both central administrators with college-wide responsibilities (45%) and division deans/associate deans with one or more degree and certificate program responsibilities (55%). Within this dichotomous division of responsibilities, the overall gender ratio of about 70/30 was also present.

The distributions of age across both groups approximate normal curves. Over half of both groups are between the ages of 41 and 55. On the average, chairpersons are slightly younger than administrators; 22% of the chairpersons are 40 or less compared to 13% of the Administrators. The age distributions across regions is also very similar.

Age. The age distribution of chairpersons and administrators is presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Age Distribution of Chairpersons and Administrators

Age categories	Chairpersons		Administrators	
	N	%	N	%
26-30	4	1%	-	-
31-35	21	8%	1	2%
36-40	36	13%	7	11%
41-45	48	17%	12	19%
46-50	54	20%	15	23%
51-55	45	17%	10	15%
56-60	32	12%	12	19%
61-65	15	5%	2	3%
over 65	18	7%	5	8%
Totals	273	100%	64	100%

Comparing age distributions by principal program area resulted in very similar findings except that Public Service chairpersons tend to be younger; 57% are 40 years old or less.

Ethnic Background. All administrators indicated White/Caucasian as their background. Four (4) respondents chose not to answer the item. The responses of the department chairpersons were 92% White, 4% Black, 2% Native American and 1% each Spanish-surnamed and other (unspecified). All minority chairpersons, with the exception of two individuals, are from Regions 2 and 3. Seventeen (17) persons chose not to respond. These data almost mirror the ethnic distribution of the faculty.

SECTION C: SELECTED EXPERIENCE VARIABLES

Summary Profile

Faculty

- 67% hold a masters degree
- 15% hold certificates of advanced study or doctoral degrees
- 20% of CUNY faculty hold doctorates
- Nearly two-thirds of the faculty earned their highest degree since 1968; 17% since 1978
- Over 88% of the advanced degrees are in the holder's teaching field (68%) or in education (20%)
- Over half of the faculty have taken credit-bearing course work beyond their last degree during the past five years
- Of the faculty taking credit courses, 56% do so in their teaching field; 22% in higher education
- 55% have been at their institution 10 years or more
- 40% of ATC faculty compared with 22% of SUNY Community College faculty have been at their institution 15 years or longer
- Over one-third of the faculty have taught at other colleges and 40% have taught at other educational institutions
- Approximately 30% of the faculty changed residence to accept their current position but the range among regions was from less than 10% in Regions 2 and 12 to over 50% in Regions 7 and 8
- Natural Science faculty are most likely to have changed residence (54%) and Health faculty least likely (14%)
- Nearly half of the faculty's previous positions were teaching at some level; 36% list business and industry as their previous position
- 74% of the faculty have had business experience related to their teaching field

Department Chairpersons and Administrators

- About 25% of chairpersons and administrators have two years or less experience in their current position
- 87% of both groups were faculty/staff at the same college or another college before accepting their current position

Description by Selected Experience Variables: Highest Earned Degree

In order to profile experience variables, several items requested relevant information including highest earned degree, the year in which highest degree was conferred, the relationship of degree field to teaching field and credit-bearing course work taken beyond the last conferred degree.

Table 21

Highest Earned Degree by Region

Region	Total N	Assoc.	Bach.	Masters	Cert.Adv. Study	Doctorate
1-Long Island	248 13.1	3.2%	9.7%	72.6%	5.6%	8.9%
2-New York City	345 18.2	2.6%	8.7%	62.3%	6.1%	20.3%
3-Lower Hudson	196 10.3	4.1%	15.3%	64.3%	5.6%	10.7%
4-Capital District	190 10.0	3.7%	11.1%	67.9%	4.2%	13.2%
5-Northeast	28 1.5	.0%	7.1%	78.6%	7.1%	7.1%
6-St. Lawrence	75 4.0	5.3%	20.0%	62.7%	2.7%	9.3%
7-Mohawk Valley	141 7.4	9.2%	9.9%	71.6%	1.4%	7.8%
8-Western Catskill	131 6.9	6.1%	24.4%	56.5%	.8%	12.2%
9-Central New York	64 3.4	.0%	25.0%	68.8%	3.1%	3.1%
10-Central West	90 4.8	2.2%	10.0%	76.7%	3.3%	7.8%
11-Central South	27 1.4	.0%	.0%	88.9%	.0%	11.1%
12-Niagara	201 10.6	3.0%	20.4%	68.7%	2.0%	6.0%
13-Southwest	158 8.3	10.8%	12.7%	63.9%	5.1%	7.6%
Totals	1894 100%	4.3%	13.4%	67.1%	4.1%	11.1%

(Missing Observations = 28)

Table 21 indicates that two-thirds of faculty respondents hold masters degrees, 11% doctorates, 13% Bachelor of Science degrees, 4% certificates of advanced study and 4% associate degrees. Twenty percent (20%) of the respondents from Region 2 hold doctorates. While some regional differences can be pointed out, such as Region 11 having all respondents in masters and doctorate categories, differences among regions are not extreme.

Table 22

Highest Earned Degree by College Type

Degree	Upstate Comm. Coll.		ATC's		CUNY		Independents	
Associate	39	4%	31	7%	9	3%	3	5%
Bachelors	140	14%	70	15%	30	9%	14	23%
Masters	717	70%	297	64%	215	62%	41	66%
Certificate Advanced Study	38	4%	15	3%	21	6%	4	6%
Doctorate	90	9%	50	11%	70	20%	0	-
Total	1024		463		345		62	
Missing cases	4		21		3			

Further examination of faculty by type of college reveals little new information except a higher percentage of faculty with bachelors degrees are from the Independent sector. Overall, the masters is the predominant degree, and proportionately more doctorates are held by CUNY faculty than faculty from other college types.

Table 23
Frequencies by Region and Year in Which
Highest Degree was Conferred

Region	Total N	Year Highest Degree Was Conferred					
		1939-48	49-58	59-68	69-73	74-78	79-83
1-Long Island	239 13.0%	3.3%	10.5%	20.5%	21.3%	24.7%	19.7%
2-New York City	332 18.1%	2.1%	12.3%	32.5%	22.0%	16.3%	14.8%
3-Lower Hudson	192 10.5%	1.6%	8.9%	30.7%	25.0%	17.2%	16.7%
4-Capital District	182 9.9%	.5%	6.6%	24.7%	24.2%	28.0%	15.9%
5-Northeast	28 1.5%	.0%	3.6%	14.3%	39.3%	21.4%	21.4%
6-St. Lawrence	75 4.1	1.3%	8.0%	21.3%	30.7%	25.3%	13.3%
7-Mohawk Valley	135 7.4	.7%	11.1%	22.2%	24.4%	21.5%	20.0%
8-Western Catskill	126 6.9%	2.4%	11.1%	23.0%	23.0%	23.8%	16.7%
9-Central New York	64 3.5%	.0%	1.6%	21.9%	20.3%	35.9%	20.3%
10-Central West	84 4.6%	3.6%	10.7%	21.4%	25.0%	29.8%	9.5%
11-Central South	26 1.4%	.0%	3.8%	19.2%	38.5%	19.2%	19.2%
12-Niagara	197 10.7%	1.0%	5.1%	17.8%	28.4%	34.5%	13.2%
13-Southwest	155 8.4%	1.3%	7.7%	20.0%	30.3%	21.3%	19.4%
Totals	1835 100.0%	1.7%	8.9%	24.1%	25.0%	23.7%	16.5%

Year in Which Highest Degree Conferred. Table 23 summarizes data regarding the year in which highest degrees were conferred. Approximately 11% of the faculty earned their highest degree prior to 1958. The three time periods of 1959-68, 1969-73 and 1974-78 each account for approximately one-quarter of the faculty's highest degrees. Over 16% of the respondents earned their highest degree within the last five years.

All but two regions show approximately 40% of their faculty receiving their highest degrees within the last ten years. The percentages in Regions 2 and 3 are 31% and 34% respectively. No major differences exist among college types. For example, the percentage of faculty receiving their highest degree during the past five years was 15.6% for SUNY Community Colleges, 18% for ATC faculty and 16.5% overall.

Field of Degree. The responses describing the field(s) of degrees were coded as: in teaching field, in education, somewhat related to teaching field or unrelated to teaching field. The following table summarizes these data. Since many faculty have more than one degree, data are presented by a total listing of each degree. The education category includes Business Education, Science Education and other degree fields that include the word education, as well as fields such as Guidance, Educational Administration and Higher Education.

Table 24
Relationship of Degree Field to Teaching Field

N =	Associate 456	Bachelors 1562	Masters 1395	CAS 114	Doctorate 204
In Teaching Field	87.5%	74.7%	67.7%	69.3%	68.1%
Somewhat Related	6.1%	9.7%	5.9%	6.1%	8.8%
Unrelated	2.0%	3.5%	0.7%	2.6%	1.0%
Education	4.4%	12.0%	22.0%	21.1%	17.6%

The table shows a high congruency of teaching fields and degree fields, particularly when education degrees are included with those in the teaching field, for example, Business Education or Science Education.

Credit Course Enrollment. Respondents were asked to identify the amount of credit-bearing course work taken beyond their last degree within three time frames: during the past 5 years, 6 to 10 years ago, or over 10 years ago. The responses are aggregated by occupational education planning region:

Table 25

Frequency of Credit Course Enrollment by Region

Total numerical average	57.4%	32.9%	26.9%
Total N =	1600	356	271
Region	Within Last 5 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
1 - Long Island	57.3	25.8	21.9
2 - New York City	49.3	25.6	29.9
3 - Lower Hudson	54.6	30.6	33.9
4 - Capital District	58.4	38.0	23.2
5 - Northeast	55.6	10.5	5.9
6 - St. Lawrence	61.6	64.3	42.1
7 - Mohawk Valley	59.0	42.4	30.1
8 - West Catskill	63.9	53.2	50.0
9 - Central	46.7	25.0	11.1
10 - Central West	49.3	29.5	19.5
11 - Central South	59.3	22.7	4.8
12 - Niagara	67.7	23.8	16.4
13 - Southwest	65.5	62.9	51.0

Over half of the respondents have (or are, in many cases) enrolled in credit-bearing courses within the past five years. Regional differences in participation rate can be anticipated when the age of colleges in each region and the existence or relative lack of graduate level institutions nearby are taken into account. The apparent lower participation rate in Region 5 could be a result of those two factors and, conversely, the higher apparent participation rate in Regions 1, 2, 3 and 4. The higher participation rate over 10 years ago in Regions 6, 8 and 13 may in part be a function of each of those regions being dominated numerically by faculty from Agricultural and Technical Colleges, which as a group, are the oldest two-year colleges in the State and should have had larger numbers of faculty in the 1960's enrolled in credit-bearing courses.

Enrolling in different amounts of credit-bearing courses was examined in relation to several identification and demographic variables. The only statistical significance found (chi square, $p < .05$) was the relationship with one faculty rank. Lecturers were significantly more likely to be taking 16-29 credit hours than faculty of other ranks. Since Lecturers were concentrated in New York City colleges this finding may reflect the desire of Lecturers to gain advanced degrees and become more eligible for professorial positions in CUNY institutions.

Further information was sought relative to the number of credit hours taken in four categories: in teaching field, unrelated to teaching field, higher education or other. These data are aggregated in Table 26.

Table 26

Frequency and Field of Credit Hours

Number of Credit Hours	<u>Number of Faculty Taking Hours</u>			
	In Teaching Field	Unrelated to Teaching Field	Higher Education	Other
1-3	197	116	100	21
4-6	156	63	64	11
7-15	240	53	102	25
16-29	131	19	36	12
30-40	101	11	26	3
41+	88	15	22	9
Total Frequencies	913	277	350	81

The three categories of number of hours, 1-3, 4-6, 7-15, combine to account for approximately 75% of all faculty taking credit courses in each category. The dominance of hours in the teaching field is consistent with the finding that most faculty hold degrees in their teaching field. The spread into unrelated and higher education may reflect degree requirements of major and minor fields. The "other" category was not often used. The responses in that category included computer-related courses and other special interest courses which could be termed "unrelated" but respondents chose to list in the "other" category.

These data were also examined by region. Quantity of credit hour patterns tended to follow those of the participation rate table; regions with older and larger colleges and closer geographic proximity to a variety of graduate level programs account for most of the credit hours taken.

Previous Experience. Faculty were requested to indicate years they have been employed at their current institution, at other colleges, and/or other educational institutions. Table 27 presents the responses by region

by the number of years at the institution.

Table 27

Years at Current Institution by Region

Region	N	1-2 yrs.	3-5 yrs.	6-9 yrs.	10-14 yrs.	15-19 yrs.	20+ yrs.
1-Long Island	250	9%	21%	18%	28%	16%	8%
2-New York City	346	8%	6%	12%	35%	27%	12%
3-Lower Hudson	197	17%	13%	14%	27%	21%	8%
4-Capital District	189	21%	17%	10%	27%	21%	5%
5-Northeast	27	22%	48%	7%	22%	-	-
6-St. Lawrence	76	14%	22%	13%	25%	21%	4%
7-Mohawk Valley	141	18%	18%	16%	21%	19%	9%
8-West Catskill	134	14%	13%	11%	33%	17%	11%
9-Central	64	20%	14%	36%	20%	6%	3%
10-Central West	89	14%	22%	25%	25%	13%	1%
11-Central South	26	4%	11%	12%	46%	19%	8%
12-Niagara	199	9%	24%	20%	28%	10%	9%
13-Southwest	167	19%	11%	10%	19%	32%	9%
Totals	1905	14%	16%	15%	28%	19%	8%

The number and percentage totals of the total sample are also included in the table. The distribution reflects the relative youth of many of the colleges; 45% have been at their college less than ten years. Approximately the same percentage of faculty are in the 1-2 and 3-5 categories as in the 10-14 years category. The 10-14 year group holds the highest percentage of respondents overall and in all regions except 5, 9 and 13. Region 5 has faculty with fewer years at their institution; Regions 2 and 13 are regions with the largest percentages in the 15 years plus categories.

As with other variables, the age of the various institutions, CUNY and Agricultural and Technical Colleges may be a factor in the distribution.

Examination of these data by type of college confirms this relationship: ATC responses in 15-19 and 20+ categories were over 40% while SUNY Community College responses for the two older groups accounted for only 22% of the respondents.

The same data were examined by major program area. Not surprisingly, nearly 70% of the Data Processing faculty have been at their institution nine years or less and nearly 37% two years or less. Natural Science faculty have been at their institutions the longest, 45% 15 years or more, reflecting the ATC college influence on the data. The other major program areas generally reflect the overall distribution.

Approximately one-third of faculty respondents indicated they had experience at other colleges. Over half of the SUNY Community College respondents and nearly half of the ATC respondents are included in this figure. Table 28 presents the data displayed by principal teaching cluster of those with experience at other colleges.

Table 28

Years at Other Colleges by Teaching Cluster

Program	N	1 yr.	2-3 yrs.	4-6 yrs.	7-10 yrs.	11+ yrs.
Data Processing	42	29%	26%	21%	14%	10%
Health	169	20%	37%	21%	13%	9%
Engineering	106	22%	33%	27%	9%	9%
Natural Science	83	20%	41%	18%	11%	10%
Business	218	26%	35%	19%	11%	9%
Public Service	44	25%	50%	11%	12%	2%
Certificate	7	-	29%	71%	-	-
Totals	669	23%	36%	21%	11%	9%

Over half of the experience at other colleges was for three years or less, and 80% of the experienced faculty fall within the six years and

less categories. Although Business and Health faculty comprise the numerical majority of those having 2-3 years experience, Public Service and Natural Science faculty show larger within-program percentages in the 2-3 year category. The small number of respondents in the Certificate row cautions against stating their different experience distribution as being representative of Certificate program faculty statewide.

Table 29 presents responses to years experience in institutions other than college by principal teaching clusters.

Table 29

Years in Other Educational Institutions

Program	N	1 yr.	2-3 yrs.	4-6 yrs.	7-10 yrs.	11+ yrs.
Data Processing	37	13%	30%	22%	22%	13%
Health	217	15%	35%	25%	15%	10%
Engineering	102	22%	32%	22%	15%	9%
Natural Science	77	19%	26%	25%	23%	7%
Business	273	13%	25%	30%	20%	12%
Public Service	39	8%	31%	33%	10%	18%
Certificate	16	25%	44%	6%	19%	6%
Totals	761	15%	30%	26%	18%	11%

Approximately 40% of the total sample have had teaching experience in other institutions, predominantly secondary schools. This non-collegiate experience base (N=761) is slightly higher than other college teaching (N=669). The average years of experience is also slightly higher; 28% have 7 or more years experience in other institutions compared to 19% having 7 or more years experience in other colleges. Data Processing and Natural Science faculty display slightly higher experience trends from other institutions but other comparisons, while somewhat different, are not significant.

Reviewing these data by college type shows that approximately 70% of the SUNY Community College staff and 60% of the Agricultural and Technical College faculty have had some experience in other institutions with 70% of the experience for both groups accounted for in the six years or less categories.

Faculty were also asked to indicate the years in their current position. The distribution of the responses arrayed by principal teaching area is presented in Table 30.

Table 30

Program	N	<u>Years in Current Position</u>					
		1-2 yrs.	3-5 yrs.	6-9 yrs.	10-14 yrs.	15-19 yrs.	20+ yrs.
Data Processing	96	40%	29%	9%	9%	12%	1%
Health	522	15%	21%	17%	30%	13%	4%
Engineering Tech.	351	19%	19%	14%	20%	17%	11%
Natural Science	195	14%	11%	15%	24%	28%	7%
Business	593	21%	20%	15%	23%	15%	6%
Public Service	108	16%	20%	29%	26%	8%	1%
Certificate	45	24%	24%	18%	16%	18%	-
Total	1910	19%	20%	16%	24%	15%	6%

The rather even distribution across the categories of years is shown at the bottom of the table. Twenty-four percent (24%) fall into the 10-14 year column. Only 6% are 20 year veterans. Reviewing the data by type of college compares favorably. The distribution is also similar to that previously displayed in Table 27 summarizing years at current institution.

Change of Residence. Faculty were asked whether or not they had changed residence to accept their current position. Table 31 presents the responses by region.

Table 31

Change Residence

Region	% No	% Yes	Total N
1-Long Island	85.7%	14.3%	251
2-New York City	91.6%	8.4%	347
3-Lower Hudson	62.4%	37.6%	197
4-Capital District	59.5%	40.5%	190
5-Northeast	60.7%	39.3%	28
6-St. Lawrence	53.2%	46.8%	77
7-Mohawk Valley	46.8%	53.2%	141
8-Western Catskill	47.4%	52.6%	135
9-Central New York	81.3%	18.8%	64
10-Central West	71.1%	28.9%	90
11-Central South	63.0%	37.0%	27
12-Niagara	91.1%	8.9%	203
13-Southwest	48.8%	51.2%	170
Totals	70.7%	29.3%	1920

While overall only 29% of the respondents changed residence to accept their current position, the regional differences range from 8.4% in Region 2 to 53% in Region 7. The three regions with the largest population, New York City, Buffalo and Long Island, have lower in-migration rates, suggesting that supply may be a factor in explaining these findings.

Responses to the same question are presented in Table 32 by principal teaching clusters.

These data show that Natural Science faculty are most likely and Health faculty least likely to have changed residence to accept their current position. About one-third of Mechanical and Engineering faculty and Public Service faculty changed residence to accept their current position.

Table 32

Change Residence to Accept Current Position

<u>Teaching Cluster</u>	<u>% No</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Data Processing	75.0	25.0	96
Health	86.0	14.0	523
Engineering Tech.	63.4	36.6	352
Natural Science	46.2	53.8	195
Business	69.8	30.2	599
Public Service	66.1	33.9	109
Certificate	73.3	26.7	45
Column Total	1358	561	1919
	70.8	29.2	100.0

(Number of Missing Observations = 3)

Examining these data by type of college shows that Agricultural and Technical College faculty were twice as likely to change residence to accept their current positions than SUNY Community College faculty (53% and 26% respectively). Change of residence rates for Independent College faculty are not large but vary among the colleges, reflecting population density of their particular regions as well as the differences associated with the principal teaching clusters. Location of the college appears to be directly related to the frequency in which change of residence accompanies faculty appointments.

The relationship of changing residence to accept current position was also examined with several identification and demographic variables. Statistical significance was found for one age category; more persons age 46-50 changed residence to accept their position than would have been expected. These incidences may be persons taking early retirement from one employer and beginning a second career.

Previous Position. A question was asked regarding the type of previous positions. Table 33 summarizes the responses.

Table 33

Type of Previous Position

Previous Position	Total Sample	
	N	%
Teaching, two-year college	212	11
Teaching, four-year college	198	10
Teaching, secondary school	358	19
Business/Industry/Military	722	36
State/Local Government Agency	134	6
Diploma Nursing Program	161	8
Student	95	5
Total	1880	95%
Missing Cases	106	5%

Nearly half (47%) of the respondent's previous positions were teaching at some level; higher education, secondary education and diploma nursing programs. The military category was an "other, specify" group of responses (N=9) that was added to the business category from the sense of being employed outside of education. This category accounted for 36% of the responses including 38 responses specified as self-employed.

A review of these data by type of college found only slight variations in the distribution of previous position categories.

A second review of these data by region found a few instances of regional variation (+ or - 5%) from the statewide averages:

- More Region 6 faculty came from secondary schools (28%).
- Fewer Region 5 faculty came from business/industry (29%).
- More Region 9 faculty came from government employment (16%).
- More Region 2 and Region 5 faculty came from diploma nursing schools (15% and 18% respectively).
- More Region 8 faculty listed student as their previous position (11%).

A similar review of these data was performed by principal teaching cluster using the same standard of + or - 5% variance from the statewide averages. No variations exceeded the arbitrary standard for the two-year college teaching category and only Natural Science faculty were more likely (20%) to have come from four-year college teaching.

Health faculty were less likely (10%) and Natural Science and Business faculty more likely (27% and 28%) to have come from secondary level teaching. Engineering (58%) and Data Processing (47%) faculty were more likely to have come from business and industry; Natural Science (27%), Health (22%) and Public Service (15%) faculty were less likely to have come from business and industry. Forty percent (40%) of the Public Service faculty (includes Criminal Justice and Human Services programs) came from state/local government employment. Natural Science faculty were somewhat more likely to come from student status (14%). Not surprisingly, 96% of the respondents listing diploma nursing schools as their previous position are Health Technology faculty.

Related Work Experience. Faculty respondents were asked whether or not they had business or industrial experience related to their teaching field and if so, how many years. Statewide, 76% responded affirmatively with no variation among regions greater than 6%.

The data on number of years experience by principal teaching cluster are presented in Table 34.

Table 34

Number of Years of Related Business Experience

Program	1-2 yrs.	3-4 yrs.	5-10 yrs.	11-15 yrs.	16-25 yrs.	26+ yrs.	Total N
Data Processing	17%	13%	34%	21%	14%	1%	77
Health	10%	17%	41%	18%	11%	4%	321
Mech-Eng.	11%	14%	39%	12%	18%	6%	305
Natural Science	31%	24%	34%	10%	-	1%	105
Business	17%	17%	35%	12%	13%	6%	516
Public Service	10%	13%	28%	17%	25%	7%	71
Certificate	3%	13%	32%	21%	24%	8%	38
Totals	14.5%	16.2%	36.5%	14.2%	13.5%	5.1%	1433
							(100%)

More than one-third of the respondents reported 5 to 10 years of related business experience and over 30%, almost the same percentage, report less than 5 years or more than 10. Fewer Natural Science faculty (11.5%) and more Public Service faculty (49.3%) and Certificate faculty (52.7%) have over ten years experience. The other principal teaching clusters generally reflect the overall averages of experience.

The degree of relatedness of the experience was estimated from responses to the item requesting position title and/or position description. These open-ended responses were coded as Directed Related, Somewhat Related, Distantly Related and Not Related. The business and industrial experience (including hospital experience) was overwhelmingly directly related (94%) to teaching field. The Distantly and Not Related categories each accounted for 1% of the responses.

Chairperson and Administrator Position History. Department chairpersons and administrators were asked only two experience questions, the

number of years they have held their current position and the nature of their previous position.

Table 35
Chairpersons and Administrators
Years in Current Position

Number of years	Dept Chairs		Acad Admin	
	N	%	N	%
1	42	15.6	11	17.2
2	32	11.9	6	9.4
3	31	11.5	6	9.4
4	20	7.4	8	12.5
5	29	10.7	4	6.4
6-9	49	18.1	15	23.4
10 years or more	67	24.8	14	21.9
Totals	270	100.0%	64	100.0%

(Missing cases = 3)

Table 35 details the responses to years in current position. Slightly more than 25% of both groups are in their first or second year, 30% are encompassed by the three year to five categories and over 40% have six or more years experience. The similarity of distributions of both groups is apparent.

It is apparent from Table 36 that the predominant career ladder for both positions is faculty or staff at a college and that most appointments have been to persons within the institution in both groups. The "other" category includes state level positions and college positions in other states. The faculty/staff position was further detailed by position title. Approximately 16% of the current chairpersons had been department chairs or deans previously. All others had faculty titles. The administrators had more varied previous positions; 28% were department chairpersons,

29% had dean or other administrative titles and 53% held faculty ranks.

Table 36

Previous Position of Chairpersons and Administrators

<u>Position</u>	<u>Dept Chairs</u>		<u>Acad Admin</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Faculty/staff; same college	218	80.4	44	68.8
Faculty/staff; other NYS coll	19	7.0	12	18.8
Private sector employment	14	5.2	1	1.6
Public sector, not education	6	2.2	1	1.6
Secondary education	3	1.1	2	3.1
Hospital, health agency	8	3.0	-	-
Other	3	1.2	4	6.3
Totals	271	100.0%	64	100.0%

(Missing cases = 2)

SECTION D: FACULTY RECRUITMENT NEEDS AND PROCEDURES

Summary Profile

Chairpersons

- Over 60% have primary responsibilities for recruitment in their department
- Over 40% state that no shortage of candidates currently exists
- Business and Health are fields where shortages most frequently exist
- Average faculty turnover is approximately 15-20% in about half of the departments
- Professional journals and associations are more frequently used to advertise vacancies in Natural Science and Engineering Technologies than other fields

Administrators

- 70% delegate recruiting responsibilities and monitor procedures
- 14% state no shortage of candidates currently exists
- Data Processing and other computer-related technologies are fields where most shortages exist

Chairpersons and Administrators

- Ratio of applicants to vacancy is approximately 5 to 1
- Business and Public Service vacancies have more applicants per vacancy than vacancies in other fields
- Local newspapers are the most widely used vacancy advertising medium but peer-to-peer networking was felt to be the most effective recruitment strategy
- Average faculty turnover is 10 to 20% in less than half of the departments
- Data Processing vacancies generally have fewest applicants
- About half of the new faculty are recruited from the local region; about 10% from out of state
- Overall, faculty are about equally likely to come from education as from business/industry but this varies somewhat among fields

Faculty Recruitment Needs and Procedures: Roles in Recruitment Process

Academic administrators and chairpersons were asked several items relating to recruitment of faculty. In terms of roles in faculty recruitment, the administrators' role may be described as follows. Approximately 30% personally direct the process while 70% see themselves in a coordinating and monitoring role after delegating the direct responsibilities. Essentially all administrators advise on, review and/or recommend candidates for employment. The often multiple role of department chairpersons may be described as follows:

- 45% are search committee members
- 62% are primarily responsible for recruitment
in their department
- 71% review and recommend candidates
- 10% act in an advisory capacity to the committee
- 2% have no role in recruitment

The responses on roles in the recruitment process show the overlap between having primary responsibility to see that the process occurs and delegating or coordinating the activity of faculty committees. It appears that 30% of the chairs do not review faculty candidates but only 2% have no role in the process.

Current Shortages of Candidates. In response to questions about current shortages of qualified candidates for faculty vacancies, 14% of the administrators and 41% of the chairpersons responded that no shortage currently exists. Identified program areas with current shortages of candidates are detailed in Table 37.

Table 37
Summary of Current Shortage of Faculty Candidates

<u>Program</u>	<u>Identified by % Dept Chairs</u>	<u>Identified by % Administrators</u>
Transportation	-	3.1%
Data Processing	-	37.5%
Health (primarily Nursing)	13.6%	9.4%
Sec Sci/Word Processing	7.0%	1.6%
Agricultural Technologies	5.1%	3.1%
Engineering Technologies	18.0%	10.9%
Business	5.5%	-
Computer-related Technologies	3.7%	17.2%
Criminal Justice	1.5%	-
Hotel Administration	4.4%	-
Other (Math, Bilingual)	-	3.2%
No Shortage	41.4%	14.1%

Engineering is identified most often by administrators and chairs (28.9% combined) as experiencing candidate shortages. Data Processing is viewed as an area of candidate shortage by over 37% of the administrators but was not mentioned by chairpersons. The Health shortages (23% combined) were primarily stated as being nursing faculty positions. The differences in Business, Hotel and Criminal Justice may be a function of department chairs' more direct involvement in searches and perhaps a stronger feeling of shortage.

Reviewing the responses by region finds perceived shortages in Data Processing and Engineering Technologies to be essentially statewide. Health faculty candidate shortages also exist statewide except in Long Island, with concentrated shortages perceived in New York City, the Lower Hudson area, the central area of the State and the Buffalo area. Computer-related shortages appear greatest in the central and western sections of

the State. Secretarial Science and Word Processing shortages appear mostly in eastern and southeastern regions, particularly in New York City and Long Island.

Anticipated Candidate Shortages. Department chairpersons and administrators were then asked if they anticipated shortages of qualified candidates to develop in the next few years.

Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the administrators and 46% of the chairpersons anticipated shortages to develop. The reasons given for the anticipated shortages are summarized in Table 38 below.

Table 38

Summary of Reasons for Anticipated Shortages

	<u>Dept. Chr.</u>	<u>Adm.</u>
Salary levels in business/industry	19%	41%
Geographic location of college	1%	3%
Retirements/budget constraints	12%	2%
Demand in high-tech fields by private sector	20%	11%
Depends on economy	4%	2%

The reasons given for anticipating shortages of qualified candidates to occur in the next few years vary somewhat but the two most frequently given reasons are essentially different ways of stating competition from business and industry, particularly in the fields termed as high tech. The predominant feeling expressed was that the higher salaries offered by business and industry will cause shortages to continue in Engineering, Data Processing and other computer-related technologies. A small number of responses indicated that the geographic location of the college (rural) contributed to faculty recruitment problems. Department chairs' concerns

with retirements and budget constraints may be another way of identifying the perceived gap between what colleges and private industry can offer in salaries to persons in high demand fields.

Faculty Turnover. In order to further clarify the responses regarding recruitment, administrators and chairs were asked to estimate the average rate of faculty turnover during the past three years and the approximate ratio of applicants per vacancy. These data are summarized below.

Table 39
Average Faculty Turnover

<u>Rate</u>	<u>Dept. Chair</u>	<u>Acad. Admin.</u>
5-10%	25%	48%
11-25%	19%	22%
26-50%	9%	2%
51-100%	2%	1%
virtually none	45%	27%

Nearly half of the department chairpersons but only slightly more than a quarter of administrators report virtually no turnover. A review of these data by principal teaching cluster revealed that the relative lack of turnover occurred in all fields but the highest turnover incidence was associated with Data Processing and Natural Science (agricultural) Technologies. Approximately half of the chairs in the other technology categories report no turnover.

Reviewing the distribution of responses by region reveals highest turnover incidence in Region 5 (83%) followed by Regions 11 and 9 (75% and 70% respectively). Region 8 responses indicate the least incidence of turnover (32%).

These data may be interpreted to mean that a faculty turnover rate of up to 25% has been experienced by over half of the departments and colleges. Faculty turnover has been experienced in all program areas but has occurred more frequently in computer-related and agricultural technologies.

Table 40 summarizes the responses to the item asking for the approximate ratio of applicants for each vacancy that has occurred during the last three years.

Table 40

Frequency of Applicant to Vacancy Ratio

<u>Rate</u>	<u>Dept. Chair</u>	<u>Acad. Admin.</u>
1 to 1	5%	2%
2 to 1	16%	20%
5 to 1	27%	27%
10 to 1	19%	21%
20 to 1	7%	3%
30 or more to 1	6%	3%
no data on which to judge	20%	24%

These data indicate that there were 5 or less applicants for each vacancy in about half of the cases where chairs and administrators felt they could make an estimate. In about 20% of the cases the number of applicants was 2 or less. In addition several of those responses carried an added comment that none were ideally qualified.

A review of the responses by region revealed no extreme differences but a general trend existed of fewer applicants in the less populated regions.

Arranging the data by principal teaching cluster reveals that 67% of the perceived ratios of applicants to Data Processing vacancies were 5 to 1 or less. Comparable Health, Engineering and Natural Science percentages were 55-60% while Business was 27% and Public Service 14%. These data confirm the recruitment problems found earlier regarding shortages in Data Processing, Natural Science and Engineering Technologies.

Recruitment Procedures. Other items probing recruitment asked about advertising strategies used and the one perceived to be most successful. Local newspapers were a medium most often used (75%+) followed by professional associations/journals. Selected state (New York Times) and national papers (Chronicle) were used by about half of the respondents. College placement services were used by less than half of the respondents and selected businesses were rarely used (7%). The "other, describe" option drew responses of contacts at other colleges, ethnic/neighborhood newspapers, SUNY vacancy announcements, files of previous applicants and the New York State Employment Service.

Suspecting that certain fields may differ in advertising scope, the data were examined by principal teaching cluster. Natural Science chairpersons were significantly less likely to use local newspapers and, with Engineering chairs, more likely to advertise in professional journals and associations. Health Technology chairpersons were significantly less likely to use the Chronicle or other national newspaper than others. Rural regions, as might be expected, used local newspapers the least.

The responses to the item asking for the most successful strategy resulted in peer networking/personal contacts being identified most frequently (over 40%) as the most successful strategy. Newspapers were cited as most successful by 23% of the chairpersons but only 5% of the administrators. Six other methods were identified but none by more than

15% of either group. Reviewing the responses by region and by principal teaching area resulted in no additional information.

In summary, it appears that newspapers and professional journals are the most common advertising media but personal contacts or peer networking is seen as the most successful recruitment technique.

Administrators and chairpersons were also asked the geographic origin of the most recently recruited faculty and whether they came from education or business. About half of the responses indicated new faculty were recruited from the college's region, beyond the region but within the State in about 25% of the instances, and from out of state in about 10% of the instances. Combinations of these three origins made up the balance of the responses. However, new Data Processing and Public Service faculty were significantly more likely to come from the local area (80% and 74% respectively) than faculty from other fields. Natural Science faculty were significantly more likely to come from out of state (28%).

Overall, the new faculty were about equally likely to come from either education or business/industry but Data Processing faculty were least likely to come from education (22%) and Natural Science and Public Service faculty most likely (59% and 53%). This approximately even split of origin between education and business did not hold up in Region 5 (predominantly education) or Regions 8 and 10 (predominantly business).

In summary, it appears that different fields publicize their vacancies in different ways but most rely on a personal network to identify candidates and a majority of the successful candidates come from nearby. This trend is supported by the low change of residence ratio reported in an earlier section and by the finding of fewer applicants per vacancy from less populated regions. The relative youth of the Data Processing field tends to explain why most new faculty in that technology come from business and

industry. The common path to a faculty position appears to vary by program area and be related to the relative concentration of the particular combination of subject matter and practical expertise that may exist locally. Advanced degree programs in Agriculture are scarce while Business and Health professionals with advanced degrees appear to exist in many communities and as such, constitute a larger number of potential candidates.

A wider scope of advertising vacancies may result in more candidates but may also be less cost effective. Since no university in New York State has a formal advanced degree program in community college education, a university-based candidate pool is not as readily accessible as it is in other states. This may contribute further to the tendency to recruit from local area working professionals.

SECTION E: ACTUAL AND PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS OF RECENTLY EMPLOYED FACULTY

Summary Profile

Actual

- 69% have a masters or higher degree
- The degree field for most (80%) is in the discipline of their teaching field
- Over half were less than 35 years old
- Over half of the new faculty in all fields, except Data Processing, have had some teaching experience
- Less than one-quarter have had two-year college teaching experience
- Over half of the newer faculty, except Natural Science faculty, have had business/industry experience

Preferred

- Hold masters or higher degree (80%)
- Degree in teaching discipline (85%)
- Less than 35 years of age (77%)
- College teaching and/or business/industry experience (76%)

General Preparation

Recently employed faculty were perceived to be:

- well prepared in subject area knowledge
- acceptably prepared in knowledge of teaching
- acceptably prepared in knowledge of the two-year college student
- possess an acceptable degree of commitment to the two-year college level

Actual and Preferred Qualifications of Recently Employed Faculty

Several items on the chairperson questionnaire dealt with the qualifications of recently employed faculty and the qualifications that they would have preferred new faculty to possess.

The typical qualifications of recently hired full-time faculty are summarized in Table 41 arranged by principal teaching cluster of responding department chair.

Table 41

Typical Degree Status of Recently Employed Faculty

<u>Respondent Department</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Assoc</u>	<u>Bach</u>	<u>Masters</u>	<u>CAS</u>	<u>Doct</u>	<u>Mast & Doct</u>	<u>Bach & Mast</u>
Data Processing	10	10%	10%	70%	-	-	-	10%
Health Tech	72	7%	21%	49%	1%	6%	5%	11%
Engineering	63	3%	19%	48%	3%	9%	5%	13%
Natural Science	29	3%	17%	45%	-	14%	17%	3%
Business	62	-	6%	73%	2%	2%	6%	11%
Public Service	23	-	4%	74%	-	13%	5%	4%
Certificate Prog	7	29%	29%	29%	14%	-	-	-
Totals	266	4%	15%	56%	2%	7%	6%	10%

The Certificate program faculty are least typical of the norm of masters degree, and Public Service faculty display the greatest percentage (92%) of masters and higher degrees. Business faculty also show a high percentage (81%) of masters and higher degree status. A majority of all new faculty hold a masters degree.

Over 80% of the respondents indicated the typical field of the degree to be in the appropriate discipline field. Approximately 10% of the degrees were in education and approximately 10% indicated combinations of

education and the discipline field.

The age distribution of the typical newly employed faculty was in the range of 25-34 (52%) and 35-44 (35%) years of age. Only 10% were reported as being 45 or older.

The experience data were varied.

Table 42

Experience of Recently Employed Faculty

	N	Secondary Tching	Two-Yr. College	Four-Yr. College	Business/ Industry	College/ Industry	No Previous Experience
Data Processing	10	-	-	10%	70%	20%	-
Health	75	7%	13%	9%	32%	36%	3%
Engineering	62	10%	12%	8%	40%	27%	3%
Natural Science	29	14%	11%	17%	17%	28%	3%
Business	62	17%	12%	15%	13%	40%	3%
Public Service	23	8%	23%	8%	26%	35%	-
Certificate	6	-	-	-	33%	67%	-

Table 42 details the responses regarding the typical business/industry and teaching experience held by recently employed faculty. Well over half of the faculty have had some teaching experience except. Less than 15% have had two-year college teaching experience except in Public Service programs. Secondary teaching experience has a similar distribution across programs. Data Processing faculty are most likely to be recruited from business and industry and over half of all faculty, except Natural Science faculty, have had some business/industry experience. The small number of responding certificate program faculty are most likely to have both college teaching and industry experience.

By way of contrast, the next item asked for the qualifications and experience that chairpersons would have preferred candidates to have. The responses were a strong desire for a masters degree or higher (80% overall preferred versus 56% actual from Table 41). The bachelors degree was preferred by about 16% overall, primarily in Certificate, Health and Engineering programs. This preference for the bachelors degree may be influenced by a perception of shortage of candidates with masters degrees.

The preferred age was also slightly younger with 77% preferring ages less than 35. The preferred field of the degree was the respective discipline for 85% of the cases. The preferred experience was slightly higher for business and industry experience, 41% overall, but roughly the same as the distribution shown in Table 42. The value expressed for industry experience was greatest from Data Processing and Engineering program chairs. Overall the two columns, Business or Industry, College Teaching and Industry Experience account for 76% of the preferences. Two-year college teaching by itself was listed as a preference in about 10% of the cases overall, greatest in Health at 33%. These responses may also reflect a sense of reality of candidates' backgrounds rather than the preferred ideal.

Chairpersons and administrators were also asked to assess the preparation of recently employed faculty members in terms of knowledge of subject area, teaching, two-year college students and commitment to the two-year college. Their responses are summarized in Table 43.

Table 43
Attributes of Recently Employed Faculty

Attribute	Well Prepared		Acceptable		Somewhat Lacking	
	Chairs	Admin	Chairs	Admin	Chairs	Admin
Knowledge of subject area	83%	91%	15%	9%	2%	-
Knowledge of teaching	40%	17%	49%	71%	11%	12%
Knowledge of students	37%	14%	43%	57%	20%	29%
Commitment to two-year college	52%	36%	42%	52%	6%	12%

Both groups agree on the preparation in terms of subject area knowledge but administrators are more likely than chairpersons to rate knowledge of teaching, students and commitment as Acceptable. Knowledge of two-year college students was most often rated as Somewhat Lacking.

The responses were also examined by region and by principal teaching cluster. Region 10 chairs were twice as likely as chairs from other regions to rate faculty recently employed as lacking in knowledge of two-year college students. Chairpersons from Regions 6 and 11 were significantly below the overall average in their ratings of knowledge of subject area. Regions 1 and 4 tended to rate higher than other regions on both knowledge of subject area and two-year college students.

There were only minor differences among the respondents when reviewed by principal teaching program. The overall impression to be gained from these data are that chairpersons and administrators are generally satisfied with competencies possessed by recently employed faculty, especially with their knowledge of their subject area.

SECTION F: INSERVICE EDUCATION PARTICIPATION, PREFERENCES AND PRIORITIES

Summary Profile

Faculty

- At least 85% of all faculty have participated in some type of professional development activity during the past three years
- The type of inservice education preferred by over half of the faculty is local or regional workshops
- Over half prefer a subject matter or field content focus for inservice opportunities compared with nearly one-quarter who prefer a teaching-oriented focus
- Health and Public Service faculty show stronger than average preference for teaching-oriented inservice opportunities
- Data Processing and Engineering Technology faculty show stronger than average preference for content-oriented inservice opportunities

Chairpersons and Administrators

- Perceive updating in content areas to be the highest priority for faculty inservice education
- Perceive teaching techniques as the second priority need for faculty inservice education
- Other important topics are student advising, understanding student needs and computer-related topics
- Tend to prefer workshops as the delivery mode, held locally or regionally, at times that do not conflict with teaching responsibilities

Inservice Education Participation and Preferences: Non-Credit Activities

Faculty were asked if they had participated in non-credit bearing professional development activities during the past three years and if so, in what type of activities. Four types of activities were listed: local workshops, professional association meetings, funded project workshops and personal study. Respondents could also use an Other, Specify category.

Only 10% of the faculty indicated that they had not participated in some type of activity. This 90 to 10 distribution was consistent across regions and among college types. The variation in responses by teaching program was 5% or less with the exception of Certificate program faculty who indicated an 83% participation rate.

The frequencies of participation in each of the types of professional development activities are presented in Table 44, organized by principal teaching cluster. Most faculty checked more than one type of activity.

Table 44

Participation in Professional Development Activities
by Type of Activity and Teaching Cluster

Type of Activity	Total #	DataPro	Health	Mech Eng	NatSci	Bus	PubSer	Cert
Local workshops	1302	4%	34%	16%	9%	28%	7%	2%
Prof. assoc. meetings	1288	4%	32%	16%	9%	30%	7%	2%
Funded project workshops	398	4%	34%	18%	12%	23%	7%	2%
Personal study	970	5%	29%	19%	10%	29%	6%	2%
National organization workshops*	18	-	28%	22%	-	33%	11%	6%
Continuing education courses*	16	-	19%	19%	-	44%	6%	12%
Trade/industry sponsored activities*	16	6%	38%	19%	6%	31%	-	-
Other, unspecified	244	5%	28%	23%	12%	23%	6%	3%
Overall Participation Rate		85%	96%	88%	87%	87%	94%	83%

*These activities were Other, Specify responses.

As shown in Table 44, of the 1,302 responses of participation in local workshops, 4% were by Data Processing faculty, 34% by Health Technology faculty and 28% were by Business faculty. The overall participation rate in any one or more of the categories is shown at the bottom of the table.

What is remarkable is the relative consistency of participation within each principal teaching cluster. While it is clear that significantly fewer faculty participate in funded project workshops than the more general local workshops category, the share of participation across clusters is similar. Only within the Business cluster is there a difference that might be interpreted as a trend. The Other, unspecified category represents the number that checked it but did not specify the type of activity.

Health faculty appear to be slightly higher participators than other program faculty since Health faculty account for only 27% of all respondents but exceed the expected share in the four largest activity categories. Still the difference is not significant, only slightly larger than for other faculty groups.

Preferred Types of Activities. Faculty were further asked what type of professional development would be of most interest. Respondents were given four alternatives: local college workshops, credit-bearing courses, regional/statewide workshops and summer work in respective discipline. An "other, specify" category was also provided. The responses to the latter option (N=48) were similar enough to be coded into two groups: 1) funds for travel to professional meetings, conferences, campus visitations and 2) sabbatic leave opportunities. In addition, a number of faculty checked more than one of the given options and these combinations were also tabulated and categorized. The total frequencies for each of the categories is presented

by region in Table 45.

The largest number of respondents (N = 469) checked both column 1, Local Workshops, and 3, Regional Workshops. Combining the responses of columns 1, 3 and 5, it is clear that local and/or regional workshops are the preferred type of professional development activity (53.2%). Credit-bearing courses were preferred by 12.1% of the respondents and 16.6% expressed most interest in summer work in their field.

The frequency of multiple responses shown by the totals in columns 5, 6 and 7 indicate a general interest by a majority of the respondents in nearly any type of professional development activity.

Scanning the responses by region finds some variance from the distribution of total responses. Region 1 expresses more interest in local than regional workshops and Region 5 prefers regional rather than local workshops. Credit course offerings drew greater than average interest from Regions 6, 7 and 9 and very little interest from Region 11 respondents who also significantly differ in their relatively high interest in summer work in their field. Region 7 appears to be more interested in credit courses (23%) and summer work (23.7%) than most regions.

These data were also reviewed by college type but no major variance from the total distribution was found.

A review of the responses arranged by principal teaching cluster revealed the following differences in interest for types of activities.

- Mechanical and Engineering Technology faculty express greater interest in summer work (27%)
- Public Service faculty expressed slightly higher interest in local and regional workshops (63.7%)
- Data Processing faculty expressed slightly higher interest in credit-bearing courses (18.7%).

Table 45

Percentage Frequencies of Interest in Types of
Professional Development Activities by Planning Region

Region		1 Local W/shop	2 Credit Courses	3 Regional W/shop	4 Summer Work	5 Column 1 & 3	6 3 Columns Checked	7 4 Columns Checked	8 Fund Travel	9 Sabbatic Opport	Row N/ Row %
L.Island	1	21.9	13.6	5.5	15.3	22.5	13.6	5.5	2.5	.4	236 / 13.1
NYC	2	19.9	9.1	12.3	19.2	24.6	8.5	3.2	2.5	.6	317 / 17.6
LowHud	3	15.9	9.3	14.3	14.3	28.6	12.1	4.4	1.1	-	182 / 10.1
CapDist	4	16.9	11.9	10.2	11.3	29.9	13.6	4.0	1.1	1.1	177 / 9.8
N-east	5	11.1	7.4	37.0	3.7	18.5	18.5	3.7	-	-	27 / 1.5
StLaw	6	9.6	21.9	9.6	17.8	24.7	12.3	1.4	-	2.7	73 / 4.1
MohValley	7	11.9	23.0	17.0	23.7	11.1	6.7	5.9	-	.7	135 / 7.5
W-Catsk	8	12.7	7.1	6.3	15.1	38.9	13.5	4.0	2.4	-	126 / 7.0
Cent NY	9	16.4	27.9	18.0	11.5	13.1	9.8	3.3	-	-	61 / 3.4
CentWest	10	9.2	8.0	13.8	14.9	29.9	12.6	5.7	3.4	2.3	87 / 4.8
CentSo	11	4.0	4.0	16.0	28.0	32.0	8.0	4.0	-	4.0	25 / 1.4
Niagara	12	17.5	8.2	8.2	19.1	28.9	10.3	5.7	2.1	-	194 / 10.8
SoWest	13	12.7	12.0	8.2	16.5	30.4	12.0	2.5	4.4	1.3	158 / 8.8
Col Total		287	217	200	298	469	203	76	35	13	1798
Col %		16.0	12.1	11.1	16.6	26.1	11.3	4.2	1.9	.7	100%

With these exceptions, the distribution of responses among principal teaching clusters generally resembled the distribution of all respondents.

Overall, approximately 40% of the respondents chose to check more than one type of activity even though they were not asked to do so. The multiple responses, in addition to the single indications of interest for local and regional workshops, seem to indicate a high interest in non-credit short-term professional development opportunities within driving distance. Summer work and credit courses each have a numerically small clientele.

Preferred Focus for Inservice. The item asking for the preferred focus of inservice activities included two options to check; teaching oriented or subject/content oriented. An "other, specify" option was also provided.

Teaching-oriented was checked by 23% of the respondents and subject/ content was checked by 57.9%. In addition, 13.4% of the respondents checked both responses. The remaining 6% of the sample checked "other, specify" or "other" and one or both of the given options. Of the 6% "other" responders, half (3% of the total sample) specified a computer-related topic as their preferred focus.

Reviewing these data by type of college finds that faculty from Agricultural and Technical Colleges expressed less preference for teaching oriented (17.4%) and a greater preference for subject/content focus (68.1%). CUNY faculty expressed nearly twice the interest in computer-related focus (5.7%) than the total sample.

The results of a review of these data by region are summarized as follows:

<u>Total Sample</u>	<u>Regions with percentages not included by a range of plus or minus 5%</u>
Teaching - 23%	- Region 5 (11.1%)
Subject/content - 58%	- Region 2 (51.1%) Region 6 (64.8%) Region 7 (64.9%) Region 9 (44.1%) Region 11 (72.0%) Region 13 (65.2%)
Both foci checked - 13%	- Region 5 (22.2%) Region 6 (4.2%) Region 9 (28.8%) Region 10 (19.0%) Region 11 (4.0%)

This summary of differences from an arbitrary deviation ($\pm 5\%$) shows the relative strength of preference for subject/content focus for inservice education. This is especially strong for Regions 6 and 11 which displayed so few multiple responses. The apparent weakness of the teaching focus in Region 5 is clouded by their larger multiple response percentage. Still, the general finding is clear that a subject/content focus is preferred by at least a 2 to 1 margin.

These data were also arranged by principal teaching cluster. The results are summarized below using the same standard of plus or minus 5% from the average of total sample distribution.

<u>Total Sample Focus</u>	<u>Principal teaching cluster percentages plus or minus 5 percent</u>
Teaching - 23%	Data Processing 13.0% Health 29.7% Engineering 15.4% Public Service 30.8% Certificate 30.8%
Subject/content - 58%	Data Processing 73.9% Health 44.4% Engineering 69.8% Natural Sciences 67.6% Public Service 49.0%
Both foci checked - 13%	Data Processing 6.5% Certificate 5.1%

This analysis shows the significantly greater preference for subject/content inservice opportunities by faculty in Data Processing and Engineering Technologies. Health, Public Service and Certificate faculty respondents have a higher response rate in favor of a teaching-oriented focus but still over half of the respondents prefer a subject/content focus. It appears that the preference for subject-centered activities is related somewhat to the technological advances occurring in the fields.

Inservice Education Priorities Perceived by Chairpersons and Administrators

In order to compliment the data from faculty on their perceived inservice education priorities, chairpersons and administrators were also asked their opinions on the three highest priority inservice needs of faculty.

Table 46

Inservice Education Priorities

	<u>First Priority</u>		<u>Second Priority</u>		<u>Third Priority</u>	
	<u>Chairs</u>	<u>Admin</u>	<u>Chairs</u>	<u>Admin</u>	<u>Chairs</u>	<u>Admin</u>
Updating in field	64%	54%	17%	8%	10%	13%
Teaching techniques	22%	30%	42%	30%	25%	22%
Understanding student needs	6%	5%	24%	42%	24%	25%
Advising students	5%	8%	14%	18%	35%	34%
Other: Computer related	1%	3%	1%	-	2%	-
Other: Role of faculty	1%	-	1%	2%	4%	2%
Other: Funds for travel	1%	-	-	-	-	2%
Other: Work in industry	-	-	1%	-	-	2%

Updating in the technical fields is clearly perceived as the highest priority inservice need, and teaching techniques as the first or second priority by a majority of both groups. Understanding the needs of diverse

students and advising, were both rated frequently by some respondents as second or third priorities. The "other, specify" option drew statements and topics that were grouped into computer-related training, awareness of multiple roles of faculty members, funds for travel as an inservice activity and opportunities for faculty to work in their respective fields. The latter category is an expression of how updating might be accomplished.

Reviewing the responses by region revealed that Regions 5 and 9 rated updating significantly less frequently than others as a first priority. Region 5 respondents placed higher than average priorities on teaching and **understanding** student needs, and Region 10 rated teaching as a second priority significantly more frequently (77%). The preference for advising as a third priority was strongest in Regions 2, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 12.

Examining the **responses** by program found that Public Service chairpersons were least likely to rate updating as a first priority (35%) and were more concerned about **teaching and student** needs. Engineering program **chairpersons rated teaching** as a second priority significantly more frequently (63%) and Business and Data Processing chose advising as a third priority more **frequently** than chairs of other programs.

The general trends of the inservice preferences reinforce the high value of discipline-oriented knowledge found in preferred qualifications, degree field of faculty and faculty preferences for inservice education.

Chairpersons and administrators were also given an opportunity to state topics, **schedule, content and location of a faculty inservice program of their choice, assuming freedom of design and funding.** The item was completely open-ended, which resulted in the identification of a wide variety of topics. The responses were aggregated and summarized in Table 47.

Table 47
Faculty Development Program Topics

Topic	Chairpersons		Administrators	
	N	%	N	%
Updating in teaching field	63	23%	6	9%
Graduate credit programs	7	3%	2	3%
Instructional skills	52	19%	16	25%
Computer-related	60	22%	17	27%
Academic advising	4	2%	2	3%
Role of faculty in c.c.	4	2%	2	3%
Recruiting methods	2	1%	2	3%
Reallocate to salaries	64	23%	8	13%
Emerging technologies	17	6%	7	11%
Basic skills reinforcement	-	-	2	3%
Totals	273		64	

The recurring finding of faculty need for updating in their fields was expressed as a preferred topic by 23% of the chairpersons but only 9% of the administrators. Computer-related inservice programs were identified most frequently by administrators and also very nearly most frequently by chairpersons. Instructional skills were frequently rated, second by administrators and fourth by chairpersons. The emerging technologies label includes statements relating to both updating and computer-related but were enough different to warrant separate categorization. These topics related more to new program and curriculum development than to personal knowledge and skill attainment.

The category, reallocate to salaries, includes a significantly large number of responses particularly from chairpersons where it was the most frequently chosen "topic." In fact, the responses were actually a variety of expressions that if there were funds for a faculty development program (as the item asked them to assume), the funds would be needed more and be

better spent for salaries to remain competitive with industry or to attract more qualified faculty.

Comparing these responses to an open-ended item with the priorities for inservice programs reported in Table 46 where advising and student needs were provided as topics to check, one finds a distinctly lower value for updating and advising. Instructional skills, however, holds its relative value, and computer-related and reallocate to salaries emerge as important values. Although computer-related was only barely identified under the "other, specify" topic in Table 46 (1%-3%), it was one of the most frequently identified topics by chairpersons in response to this open-ended "assume design freedom and funds" item.

A review of the responses by region resulted in no new interpretations. Analysis by principal program area, however, resulted in some added information. Updating and emerging technologies account for 70% of the responses from Data Processing chairpersons and less than 20% of the responses from Business chairpersons.

Natural Science program chairs, followed by Engineering and Business chairs, identified computer-related more frequently than other program chairpersons. Instructional skill responses were led by Public Service and Health program chairpersons. The reallocate for salaries category had a range of response frequencies from 34% (Business) to 13% (Public Service) indicating a generalized opinion rather than being related to only one or two program areas.

Less than half of the respondents included a preferred schedule for the self-designed inservice program. A one-day workshop was preferred by 34% of the administrators and 24% of the chairpersons (combined N=40). A workshop design of several sessions over two or three days was preferred

by 29 respondents.

The second most frequent schedule preference from both chairpersons and administrators was stated in various ways but the general message was that it should not conflict with teaching duties (N=36).

Inservice during the summer was the choice for 21 chairs and 4 administrators which included those who suggested the topic of faculty work opportunities with business and industry. A preference for monthly sessions, program during orientation, and weekends, was indicated by 5% or less of each respondent group.

The generalized preferred scheduling can be stated as a workshop format held when attendance would not be a conflict with teaching.

The preferred location was on-campus for a majority of the respondents. A university or off-campus conference center was chosen by approximately 15%, and within the region (driving distance) by approximately 10% of each respondent group. Fourteen percent (14%) of the chairpersons specified a population center as their preferred location, that is, where more diversified and probably technologically advanced businesses and industries would be located as compared to their own local area.

Funding support was mentioned by only 23% of the chairpersons and 12% of the administrators. Faculty stipends for participation and/or cost reimbursement of some type was the predominant message. Released time for faculty was identified as necessary by 21 respondents.

Approximately 20% of the respondents listed more than one inservice program topic. The following are reported with the number of persons that identified each as an alternative or second inservice program priority. The topic titles are subjective summaries of open-ended responses and tend to reinforce or define several of the first choice priorities.

Currency of field knowledge and curriculum - 31
Faculty exchange-campus visits - 18
Interpersonal communications - 10
Awareness of diverse student needs - 8
Developing/using information systems - 6

The currency and student needs items add to the importance of similar topics reported previously. Interpersonal communications and information systems items could also be more specific definitions of faculty roles in the department and college planning processes. Faculty exchange and inter-campus visits can be viewed as a method of keeping current or updating within content areas more than new topics.

Administrators were also asked to assume they could design and fund a professional development program for department chairpersons and were invited to briefly describe such a program by topic, location, funding and schedule.

The most frequent response (30%) was essentially none, that the money, if available, could be more effectively used to bolster salaries. Workshops on new and emerging technologies was identified by 16% of the administrators and academic advising was listed as the preferred topic by 14%. Workshops on computer-related topics, improving instructional skills of faculty, advanced degree credit courses, keeping current in their field, intercampus visitations and work opportunities with appropriate businesses are topics each of which were listed by less than 10% of the respondents. So few went further that the design responses can be summarized as scheduling the program when classes are not in session and providing stipends or other financial support.

SECTION G: FUTURE CAREER PLANS

Summary Profile

Faculty

In the next three to five years

- 5% of the faculty plan to retire
- 20% are open to a change or undecided
- 67% plan to continue teaching at their college
- 7% plan to continue teaching at the two-year college level
- Fewer CUNY faculty are open to a change than faculty from other sectors
- Although there are regional differences, Data Processing and Engineering Technology faculty are more open to a change than faculty of other program areas

Administrators and Chairpersons

In the next three to five years

- 65% of both groups plan to continue in their current position
- 8% of the administrators and 4% of the chairpersons plan to retire
- 11% of the chairpersons and 3% of the administrators plan to return to teaching full time
- 13% of the administrators plan to seek/accept another administrative position
- 15% of the chairpersons and 11% of the administrators are undecided

Future Career Plans of Faculty

Faculty were asked to check one of seven statements that best defined their career plans for the next three to five years. These data are displayed below for the 1,884 persons that responded.

Table 48

Near Future Career Plans

<u>Statements of Future Plans</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
I plan to continue teaching at this college.	1267	67.3%
I plan to continue teaching at the two-year college level.	122	6.5%
I plan to retire.	93	5.0%
I plan to work in my field but not in education.	14	.7%
I plan to work in a different field, not in education.	3	.2%
I am open to a change if an opportunity arises.	290	15.4%
I am undecided.	77	4.1%
Other; expect to be retrenched	14	.7%
Other; go into administration	4	.2%

The responses show that two-thirds of the respondents plan to continue teaching at the same college, and 6.5% plan to continue teaching at the two-year college level. Nearly 20% are open to a change or are undecided. Five percent (5%) plan to retire. The four remaining options, including the "other, specify" responses, were chosen by less than 2% of the respondents.

The responses were regrouped for further analyses into four categories, presented in Table 49, and arranged by type of college.

Table 49
Future Plans by Type of College

	SUNY CC	CUNY	ATC	Independent
Remain at this college	67.3%	71.9%	63.9%	61.7%
Remain in two-year college	8.2%	8.7%	5.8%	3.3%
Retire	4.6%	7.5%	5.3%	1.6%
Open to a change	20.0%	11.9%	25.0%	33.3%

Differences among faculty by type of college are apparent. City University faculty have the highest percentage of persons who plan to stay at their college and who plan to stay in a two-year college. These two categories account for approximately 80% of the responses from CUNY faculty, 75% of SUNY Community College faculty, 70% of the SUNY Agricultural and Technical College faculty and 65% of the Independent College faculty. Independent College faculty have only 1.6% who expect to retire, but one-third are open to a change compared with 25% of ATC faculty and 20% of the SUNY Community College faculty.

These data indicate that most colleges, except CUNY colleges, may be replacing at least 25% of their faculty in the next few years, if opportunities for a change become available.

The range of responses by region in the open to change category are from a low of about 12% in Regions 1 and 2 to about 30% in Regions 6 and 8. Only four regions show less than 20% selecting open to a change. Regions 13 and 2 will experience greater retirement frequencies than other regions.

Table 50
Future Plans by Planning Region

Region	Same College	Two-Year College	Retire	Open to Change	N
1-Long Island	76.3%	7.1%	4.6%	12.1%	240
2-New York City	71.9%	8.7%	7.5%	11.9%	335
3-Lower Hudson	66.8%	8.2%	5.4%	19.6%	184
4-Capital District	65.8%	5.4%	2.7%	26.1%	184
5-Northeast	77.8%	3.7%	-	18.5%	27
6-St. Lawrence	58.1%	9.5%	4.1%	28.4%	74
7-Mohawk Valley	57.7%	10.2%	5.8%	26.3%	137
8-West Catskill	55.7%	12.2%	1.5%	30.5%	131
9-Central New York	62.9%	11.3%	3.2%	22.6%	62
10-CentWest	71.3%	1.1%	3.4%	24.1%	87
11-CentSouth	76.0%	-	4.0%	20.0%	25
12-Niagara	65.1%	8.2%	6.2%	20.5%	195
13-SouthWest	65.0%	3.1%	8.6%	23.3%	163
					1844

The regional percentages of faculty intending to stay at the same college vary from 55.7% in Region 8 to over 75% in Regions 1, 5 and 11. The impact of ATC and Independent College trends are evidenced in Regions 6, 8, 13 (ATC) and 12 (Independent). Overall, at least two-thirds of the faculty plan to remain at the two-year college level in all regions and this percentage is at least 80% in three regions.

These data show the differences in distribution of future plans by principal teaching cluster (Table 51). Although the variance is not extreme, Business has the highest percentage of faculty planning to remain at their college and the lowest percentage, except for Certificate faculty, open to change, closely followed by Engineering and Natural Science faculty. Nearly 10% of Public Service faculty expect to retire.

Nearly all differences, however, are within five percentage points of the total sample distribution presented previously in Table 48.

Table 51
Future Plans by Principal Teaching Cluster

	Number	Remain Here	Remain Two-Year College	Retire	Open to Change
Data Processing	94	63.8%	6.4%	3.2%	26.6%
Health	511	66.1%	7.8%	6.3%	19.8%
Engineering	339	61.9%	9.1%	5.6%	23.3%
Natural Science	184	62.5%	12.0%	3.3%	22.3%
Business	569	72.6%	5.6%	4.2%	17.6%
Public Service	105	68.6%	2.9%	9.5%	19.0%
Certificate	42	69.0%	9.5%	4.8%	16.7%
TOTALS	1844	67.1%	7.5%	5.2%	20.2%

Further analyses of the future plans responses were undertaken to attempt to better determine where the changes are most likely to occur. The data were examined by principal teaching cluster and region with the following results.

- Data Processing faculty responded open to change at a rate of 30% or more in Regions 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 13. By contrast, the percentage open to change in Region 2 was only 5.2%.
- Public Service faculty rates of open to change exceeded 30% in Regions 3 and 8.
- Engineering faculty rates of open to change were greater than 30% in Regions 3 and 8.
- Business faculty rates of open to change exceeded 30% in Regions 5, 6 and 7 but statewide, Business faculty exhibited an open to change rate of 17.6% (Table 51).
- Natural Science faculty in Region 4 and Health faculty in Region 8 also had change rates greater than 30%.

These findings indicate the existence of variance among regions that was masked by analyses of just regional and just principal teaching cluster

distributions. Although Data Processing faculty are the most likely group to be open for a change (and perhaps most likely to be able to secure positions in business in the current market), this is not true for the two downstate regions.

Analyses of future plan responses were also completed by age, sex, ethnic status and years faculty had been at their institution. Using the chi-square statistic, no significance was found for the four variables tested.

Future Plans of Administrators and Chairpersons

A similar immediate future plans question was asked of administrators and department chairpersons. Their responses are summarized in Table 52.

Table 52

Near Future Plans of Administrators and Chairpersons

	Chairpersons		Administrators	
	N	%	N	%
Continue in current position	169	65%	40	65%
Return to teaching full time	29	11%	2	3%
Seek/accept another administrative position	10	4%	8	13%
Retire	12	4%	5	8%
Leave education	3	1%	-	-
Undecided	39	15%	7	11%
Totals	262		62	

Nearly two-thirds of both respondent groups plan to remain in their current position for the next few years. Eleven percent (11%) of the chairpersons and only 3% of the administrators plan to return to teaching full time. This proportional relationship is reversed on plans to seek another administrative position. Retirement is the plan of very few and only three department chairpersons plan to leave education and seek a position in business/industry. Between 10 and 15% of each group is undecided.

Reviewing these data by region revealed that over 50% in each region plan to continue in their present position; Region 3 will experience one-third of the retirements of department chairpersons. One-half of the chairpersons who are undecided are from Regions 2 and 4.

Data Processing program chairpersons exhibited the highest frequency of undecided (30%) and return to teaching full time (20%). Engineering Technology chairpersons account for half of the planned retirements while Health program chairpersons comprise 40% of those planning to seek/accept another administrative position.

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Profile studies such as these, whether institutional or statewide, provide valuable basic data for planning as well as for comparing the present with the past. This study is a snapshot of 1983. The Beamish et al. study, referenced earlier in the report, captured similar features as they existed about eight years ago.

Since that time, the average age of postsecondary occupational faculty has not changed significantly; the percentage of minority faculty is now only slightly higher; and the gender distribution, although more near equal for recently employed faculty in some regions, has not changed dramatically.

A larger percentage of current faculty hold doctoral degrees than was the case during the middle 1970's and larger percentages of faculty are at the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. Relatively fewer faculty achieved their highest degree in the five-year period preceding this study than was reported in the Beamish study. In 1983 faculty have generally had more years experience at their current institution and a significantly greater percentage of the faculty have previous college-level teaching experience.

Department chairpersons are, on the average, four years older than the chairpersons of 1975, but the age distribution is similarly clustered in the 41-55 year range. However, a higher percentage of all chairpersons are female and are of minority ethnic status than was the case in 1975.

Because of methodological differences between this and the previous study, comparisons of faculty preferences for different types of inservice opportunities are less than precise. However, it appears that there is currently a stronger faculty interest in keeping current in their disciplines and technological fields than was expressed during the middle 1970's. Rates of faculty participation in professional development generally are very

comparable. High participation rates have been consistent.

These comparisons tend to describe a statewide faculty that is more mature in terms of rank, degree status, experience and years at their current institution but not in terms of age. They continue to participate in professional development activities at a comparable rate, but more appear to prefer technological updating opportunities, perhaps a function of our computer-led, technologically-advancing times.

The faculty turnover rate currently is double that reported in the middle 1970's, a statement which reflects how low it was then rather than how high it is now. Openings for new faculty will occur but not consistently across disciplines. As aspiring faculty member would be well advised to have at least a masters degree and some work experience outside of education but directly related to the desired teaching field. The fields with the fewest applicants for the vacancies are perceived to be Data Processing, Agricultural and Engineering Technologies, and these same fields are perceived as the ones where more vacancies are likely to occur.

There is some fear, however, that unless faculty salary levels can be increased, the kinds of faculty needed most by the colleges will find more attractive positions offered by business and industry, forcing colleges to employ persons they perceive to be less than ideally qualified.

Looking at the profile as a President of one large two-year college one might see a relatively well proportioned faculty in terms of rank, a faculty that has not aged during the past seven or eight years, that has advanced some in education and experience but very little in ethnic and gender balance. Recruitment procedures may need to be broadened, and more efforts to recruit minority and female faculty in certain programs and regions may be called for. Professional development opportunities should

continue to be provided for all faculty with particular attention to updating in the disciplines but not to the exclusion of teaching-oriented opportunities.

The President may also see a generally dedicated, well-prepared, active and satisfied faculty although signals of being open for change are present in perhaps 20% of the group. Replacing large numbers of retirees will not be an immediate problem, but the reward structure, both intrinsic and extrinsic, may need closer study particularly in the fields of Data Processing and Engineering.

The general picture is consistent with the age and maturity of post-secondary occupational education. A sense of purpose and competence is present. The picture does not show the young professional beginning to advance nor the professional near retirement age remembering what it used to be like. The snapshot is of a faculty that may be at the prime of career energy and productivity, with aspirations and frustrations, and more importantly, the potential to persevere in an age of technological advances and maintain and improve the quality of their educational programs.

APPENDIX A

BEST COPY

FACULTY SURVEY Faculty Profile Project (VEA 53-83-9105)

Two-Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

This survey is part of a statewide research project conducted in cooperation with the Bureau of Grants Administration, New York State Education Department. This instrument seeks information to serve as a basis for policy and planning activities related to preservice and inservice education, faculty replacement problems and recruitment issues associated with maintaining and improving quality postsecondary occupational and technical education in New York State. The data will be aggregated and reported by program and region. Your responses will remain anonymous. Thank you for your cooperation.

(For office
use only)

1. College: _____
2. Position: ☐ Instructor ☐ Professor
☐ Assistant Professor ☐ Other (Specify) _____
☐ Associate Professor
3. Principal teaching cluster area: (check one)
☐ Data Processing Technologies
☐ Health Services and Paramedical Technologies
☐ Mechanical and Engineering Technologies
☐ Natural Science Technologies
☐ Business and Commerce Technologies
☐ Public Service Technologies
☐ Certificate Programs; (specify): _____
4. Principal teaching program area: (i.e. nursing, accounting,...) _____
5. What is your highest earned degree?
☐ Associate ☐ Certificate of Advanced Study
☐ Bachelor's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Master's
6. In what year was the highest degree conferred? _____
7. In what field(s) is/are your degree(s)?
Associate: _____ Master's: _____
Bachelor's: _____ Doctorate: _____
Certificate of Advanced Study: _____
8. Have you taken credit bearing course work beyond your last conferred degree:
within the past 5 years ☐ yes ☐ no
6 to 10 years ago ☐ yes ☐ no
over 10 years ago ☐ yes ☐ no
If YES, please indicate approximately how many hours in each category:
☐ subjects/content of your teaching field
☐ unrelated to your teaching field
☐ higher education
☐ other; specify: _____
9. How many years of teaching experience do you have at each of the following:
☐ this institution
☐ other college(s)
☐ other educational institutions
10. How long have you been in your current position? _____ year(s)
11. Did you change residence to accept your current position? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1-4

5

6-7

8-9

10

11-12

13-16

17-20

21-22

23-25

26-29

30-33

34-35

36-37

38-39

40-41

42

(For office
use only)

12. What was your previous position?
 teaching at a two-year college business/industry
 teaching at a four-year college other: specify: _____
 teaching at a secondary school
13. Do you have business or industrial experience related to your teaching field?
 Yes No (If No skip to question 16)
14. If YES, how many years? _____
15. If YES, please provide your job title or a brief description of how this experience related to your teaching field. _____
16. Have you participated in non-credit professional development activities during the past three years? Yes No
17. If YES, what type of activities?
 local workshop(s) funded project workshops
 professional association meetings personal study
 other; specify: _____
18. What type of professional development activity would be of most interest to you?
 local college workshop(s) regional or statewide workshop(s)
 credit bearing course(s) summer work in your discipline
 other; specify: _____
19. What focus would you prefer for inservice education opportunities?
 teaching oriented subject/content oriented
 other; specific topic(s): _____
20. Which statement best defines your current career plans for the next three to five years?
 I plan to continue teaching at this college.
 I plan to continue teaching at the two-year college level.
 I plan to retire.
 I plan to work in my field but not in education.
 I plan to work in a different field, not in education.
 I am open to a change if an opportunity arises.
 I am undecided.
 Other; specify: _____

The following are optional questions, but we request that they be completed for greater accuracy of the statewide demographic profile.

21. What is your sex? Male Female
22. What is your age? 25 or less; 26-30; 31-35; 36-40; 41-45;
 46-50; 51-55; 56-60; 61-65; over 65
23. What is your ethnic background?
 White/Caucasian Spanish-surnamed Black
 Native American Asian Other: _____

Thank you for your cooperation.

43

44

45-46

47

48

49-53

54

55

56

57

58

59

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIR SURVEY
Faculty Profile Project (VBA 53-83-9105)

Two-Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

BEST COPY

This survey is part of a statewide research project conducted in cooperation with the Bureau of Grants Administration, New York State Education Department. This instrument seeks information to serve as a basis for policy and planning activities related to preservice and inservice education, faculty replacement problems and recruitment issues associated with maintaining and improving quality postsecondary occupational and technical education in New York State. The data will be aggregated and reported by program and region. Your responses will remain anonymous. Thank you for your cooperation.

(For office
use only)

1. College name: _____
2. Title: _____
3. Department/Division: _____
4. What percentage of your effort is allocated to: teaching _____ administration _____
5. How long have you held this position? _____ years
6. What was your previous position? (Check and complete below.)
☐ faculty/staff at this college (indicate rank/position)
☐ faculty/staff at another college (rank/position)
☐ other; please specify position/title and indicate employer and location: _____
7. Which best describes your usual role in faculty recruitment? (Check all that apply.)
☐ committee member role ☐ advisory role to a committee
☐ prepare search materials ☐ active in search process
☐ review and recommend candidates ☐ none
☐ primary responsibility for my department/division
☐ other; briefly describe: _____
8. From your perspective, is there a current shortage of qualified candidates for faculty vacancies in the programs in your department/division Yes No
 If YES, briefly explain: _____
9. Do you anticipate shortages of qualified candidates to develop in the next few years?
 Yes No
 Briefly explain your answer: _____
10. What has been the average occupational program faculty turnover rate during the past three years in your department/division?
☐ 5-10% ☐ 51-75%
☐ 11-25% ☐ 76-100%
☐ 26-50% ☐ essentially no turnover
11. What has been the approximate ratio of applicants per occupational/technical faculty vacancy during the past three years?
☐ 2 to 1 ☐ 20 to 1 ☐ have no data
☐ 3 to 1 ☐ 30 to 1
☐ 10 to 1 ☐ other: _____
12. How widely is a vacancy in your department/division usually advertised? (Check all that apply.)
☐ local newspaper ☐ Chronicle or other national paper
☐ professional association/journal ☐ selected businesses
☐ college placement service ☐ other: describe _____
☐ selected newspapers across State
13. Considering all recruitment strategies, including informal peer-to-peer networking, which procedure(s) has/have been most successful? _____
14. From where have your most recently hired faculty been recruited?
☐ local area/region ☐ from _____ education _____ business
☐ in-state
☐ out-of-state
☐ other; briefly describe: _____
15. How would you characterize the typical qualifications possessed by full-time faculty member(s) recently employed by your department/division?
 Degree held: ☐ Associate ☐ Master's
☐ Certificate of Advanced Study ☐ Doctorate
☐ Bachelor's
 Degree field: ☐ higher education
☐ appropriate discipline field
☐ in education
 Age: _____ 25 or less; _____ 25-34; _____ 35-44; _____ 45-54; _____ 55+
 Experience: ☐ secondary school teaching
☐ college teaching; _____ 2-year college _____ 4-year college
☐ business/industry
☐ no previous work experience
☐ other; specify: _____

1-4
5
6
7-9
10-12
13-14
15-16
17-20
21-24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31-34
35-37
38
39-40
41
42
43
44

- Degree: _____ Degree field: _____
Age: _____ Experience: _____
Other: _____

- 45
46-47
48-49
50
51-55

- _____ updating of technological advances in their field
- _____ teaching techniques
- _____ understanding different student group needs
- _____ advising students
- _____ other (specify):

-
- A horizontal number line with tick marks at 50, 55, and 60. The numbers 50 and 60 are written below the line.

- Which statement best describes your career
 _____ continue in my current position
 _____ return to teaching full time
 _____ seek another administrative position
 _____ retire
 _____ seek a position in business/industry
 _____ undecided
 other: specify:

64

65

66

67

21. What is your sex? Male Female
22. What is your age? 25 or less 46-50
 26-30 51-55
 31-35 56-60
 36-40 61-65
 41-45 over 65
23. What is your ethnic background?
- White/Caucasian Asian
 Native American Black
 Spanish surnamed Other

BEST COPY

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR FORM
Faculty Profile Project (VEA 53-83-9105)

Two-Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

This survey is part of a statewide research project conducted in cooperation with the Bureau of Grants Administration, New York State Education Department. This instrument seeks information to serve as a basis for policy and planning activities related to preservice and inservice education, faculty replacement problems and recruitment issues associated with maintaining and improving quality postsecondary occupational and technical education in New York State. The data will be aggregated and reported by program and region. Your responses will remain anonymous. Thank you for your cooperation.

(For office
use only)

1. College: _____
2. Title: _____
3. What program areas are included in your responsibilities?
☐ college-wide; ☐ degree programs ☐ certificate programs
☐ Natural Sciences Technologies
☐ Business and Commerce Technologies
☐ Allied Health Technologies
☐ Data Processing Technologies
☐ Mechanical and Engineering Technologies
☐ Public Service Technologies
☐ other; please list: _____
4. How long have you held this position? _____ years
5. What was your previous position? (Check and complete below.)
☐ faculty/staff at this college (indicate rank/position) _____
☐ faculty/staff at another college (rank/position) _____
☐ other; please specify position/title and indicate employer and location: _____
6. Which best describes your usual role in faculty recruitment? (Check all that apply.)
☐ personally direct the process
☐ delegate authority for the process but generally monitor it
☐ advisory role to department/division
☐ review candidates
☐ recommend candidate for employment
☐ other; briefly describe: _____
7. From your perspective, is there a current shortage of qualified candidates for faculty vacancies in any occupational/technical program areas? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If YES, please explain: _____
8. Do you anticipate shortages of qualified candidates to develop in the next few years?
☐ Yes ☐ No
 Briefly explain your answer: _____
9. What has been the average occupational program faculty turnover rate during the past three years?
☐ 5-10% ☐ 51-75%
☐ 11-25% ☐ 76-100%
☐ 26-50% ☐ essentially no turnover
10. What has been the approximate ratio of applicants per occupational/technical faculty vacancy during the past three years?
☐ 2 to 1 ☐ 20 to 1 ☐ have no data
☐ 5 to 1 ☐ 30 to 1
☐ 10 to 1 ☐ other: _____
11. How widely is a vacancy usually advertised? (Check all that apply.)
☐ local newspaper ☐ Chronicle or other national paper
☐ professional association/journal ☐ selected businesses
☐ college placement service ☐ other: describe _____
☐ selected newspapers across State
12. Considering all recruitment strategies, including informal peer-to-peer networking, which procedure(s) has/have been most successful?

13. From where have your most recently hired faculty been recruited?
☐ local area/region
☐ in-state
☐ out-of-state
☐ other; briefly describe: _____
 from _____ education _____ business

1-4

5

6-8

9-10

11-12

13-15

15-18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25-28

29-31

32

33-34

14. How would you generally assess the preparation of the technical faculty members recently employed?

- a) knowledge of subject area
b) knowledge of teaching
c) knowledge of two-year college students
d) commitment to the two-year college
e) other: _____

well prepared	acceptable	somewhat lacking

(For office use only)

35-39

15. In your opinion what are the three highest priority inservice needs of your occupational/technical faculty? (Please rank 1, 2, and 3)

- _____ updating of technological advances in their field
_____ teaching techniques
_____ understanding different student group needs
_____ advising students
_____ other (specify): _____

40-42

16. If you could design and fund a faculty development program of your choice, what would be most useful for your faculty? Please include topic(s), schedule, content, location, etc., in brief terms.

43-47

17. Given the same assumptions listed in item 16 above, briefly describe your choice(s) of professional development program(s) for department/division chairpersons.

48-52

18. Which statement best describes your career plans for the next few years?

- _____ continue in my current position
_____ return to teaching full time
_____ seek another administrative position
_____ retire
_____ seek a position in business/industry
_____ undecided
_____ other; specify: _____

53

The following are optional questions, but we request that they be completed for greater accuracy of the statewide demographic profile.

19. What is your sex? _____ Male _____ Female

20. What is your age? _____ 25 or less _____ 46-50
_____ 26-30 _____ 51-55
_____ 31-35 _____ 56-60
_____ 36-40 _____ 61-65
_____ 41-45 _____ over 65

21. What is your ethnic background?

- _____ White/Caucasian _____ Asian
_____ Native American _____ Black
_____ Spanish surnamed _____ Other: _____

(For office use only)

54

55

56

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL TEACHING PROGRAM BY REGION

Teaching Program	R E G I O N													Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
Data Processing	9	15	13	8	-	2	6	-	4	3	1	7	3	71
Computer Programmer	1	3	-	2	-	1	3	6	-	-	1	-	3	20
Computer Operator	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Dental Assistant	2	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Dental Hygiene	9	12	5	3	-	-	-	5	4	3	-	7	-	48
Dental Lab Tech	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Medical Lab Tech	9	14	5	7	1	2	-	2	-	-	2	8	4	54
Animal Lab Tech	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	9
Radiology	1	5	3	3	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	4	-	20
Registered Nurse	43	75	28	17	6	9	17	11	12	27	5	26	17	293
Lic Practical Nurse	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Occupational Therapy	4	1	2	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	13
Ophthalmic Dispensing	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	11
Medical Records	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	6
Psychiatric Tech	-	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Health Aide	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Surgical Tech	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	4
Inhalation Tech	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	5
General Health	2	6	8	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	26
Dietetics	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	7
Physician's Asst	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Mechanical Eng	8	9	5	2	-	3	11	5	3	5	3	4	5	63
Engineering Graphics	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
Architecture	-	6	2	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	13
Chemical Tech	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	3	-	3	-	3	-	12
Automotive Tech	3	4	-	-	-	2	4	2	-	-	-	3	12	30
Civil Technology	4	5	5	-	-	2	2	7	-	-	-	8	14	47
Electro-Mech Tech	8	26	4	5	-	6	8	7	2	3	1	17	12	99
Industrial Tech	1	3	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	2	-	13
Machine Tech	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	12
Textile	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Mechanical Tech	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	9	16
Construction Tech	6	-	-	-	-	3	1	11	1	-	-	5	4	31
Agricultural Eng	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Music Inst Repair	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Solar Technology	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Applied Comm Arts	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6
Nondestructive Test	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Natural Science	-	33	19	21	-	3	-	16	-	-	4	9	17	122
Agricultural Tech	11	-	-	25	-	3	9	4	-	2	-	-	14	68
Forestry	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
Food Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	3	9
Home Economics	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Marine Technology	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Laboratory Tech	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Sanitation Tech	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2
Conservation	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Business/General	21	15	15	12	3	6	15	8	7	4	2	8	6	122
Accounting	25	22	15	15	2	4	15	8	5	9	3	18	8	149
Banking	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	10
Marketing	29	6	7	5	1	2	2	7	2	7	-	5	6	79
Secretarial Science	27	26	9	13	3	4	14	8	2	7	1	21	10	145
Journalism	-	-	3	-	-	-	6	1	2	1	-	-	1	14
Hotel Management	2	11	5	6	-	2	-	6	2	1	-	4	-	39
Transportation	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Graphics	-	20	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	27
Travel	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	5
Paralegal	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Crafts Management	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Pub Serv General	-	3	4	6	1	-	-	-	4	2	1	-	2	23
Child Care	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	-	21
Criminal Justice	10	-	4	-	3	4	3	1	3	2	1	6	2	45
Recreation	-	-	5	-	1	1	-	3	-	-	-	3	1	14
Mortuary Science	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
TOTALS	247	339	190	189	28	76	141	133	63	86	27	199	165	1883
	13.1	18.0	10.1	10.0	1.5	4.0	7.5	7.1	6.3	4.6	1.4	10.6	8.8	100.0

Missing Observations = 39